

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XI.—SEPTEMBER, 1836.

ART. I. EXEGESIS OF ROMANS, 9: 2, 3.

By REV. HENRY MILLS, D.D. Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theological
Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

... ὅτι λυπή μοι ἐστὶ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὁδύνη ἐν καρδίᾳ μου,—
ἡυχόμεν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—ὁπέρ τῶν
ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα. . . .

* * * "that I have great sorrow, and my heart unceasing anxiety, (for
I myself did [once] wish to be anathema from Christ,) for my brethren,
my natural kindred:" * * *

ACCORDING to this version and pointing, the apostle, to obviate if possible the strong aversion of the Jews to himself and doctrine, most solemnly declares his deep and abiding solicitude on their behalf. He saw that, by their blind opposition to the gospel, they were excluding themselves from the salvation of Jesus their promised Messiah. He felt for them as brethren, and the more, as he was no stranger to the violent prejudices by which they were governed; he had himself been subject to their sway. He could sympathize in view of the awful ruin that awaited them; for he had been exposed to the same, and was snatched as a brand from the burning.

The words in parenthesis assign a special reason for Paul's peculiar solicitude.

It is no part of this interpretation that Paul, before his conversion, had wished to be anathema *for his brethren*: it simply exhibits the solemn declaration of his *present* anxiety on their account, and alleges a cause which must naturally deepen such anxiety.

Thus much to secure a right understanding of the exegesis proposed.

VOL. III.

The method of construction we have adopted has long been thought by many to be the only one that is sustained by the laws of the Greek language and by the connexion; and to furnish an easy and natural exposition of what is otherwise usually regarded a passage peculiarly difficult. But three late expositors* who have, in our own country, furnished each a volume on the Epistle to the Romans, have united, however they may differ in other respects, in pronouncing any view that regards ἡ ἐχρόμην as an ordinary imperfect, utterly untenable.† But they do not condemn without assigning their reasons,—and these it shall be our next business to consider.

With regard to ἡ ἐχρόμην, the three expositors to whom we have referred, agree in saying that it cannot mean "*I did wish*," &c.

1. Because it is the apostle's design here to shew his *present* love to the Jews; not what was *past*, which no one doubted, and the declaration of which would be perfectly irrelevant.

That Paul in the context strongly expresses an affectionate concern for the Jews we admit and maintain. Whether in the words "ἡ ἐχρόμην . . . Χριστοῦ" such present affection is declared, or rather a cause of his solicitude assigned, is the question to be settled. On this point, the objection, so far as it affects ourselves, is a mere *petitio principii*.

The rendering, "*I did wish*," we do not regard as any way connected with Paul's past love of his Jewish brethren; nor are we at all concerned in the inquiry, whether the profession of his past love would have been any thing to his purpose. But it surely is not irrelevant for Paul to allude to his former resemblance to his brethren in their prejudices and dangers, as a ground of his present sympathy and sorrow on their behalf. It is a principle of feeling and of action familiar to all in every age,

"Non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco;"

* The Rev. Professors Stuart and Hodge, and the Rev. Mr. Barnes.

† None of them, however, seems to have been apprized of any scheme of exposition that adopts the parenthesis: and hence their principal objections are levelled at those (whoever they may be,) who suppose the apostle to mean that he once wished to be anathema *for his brethren*. This seems the more surprising, as the interpretation we here attempt to sustain has been long before our religious public, recommended by the names of Drs. Dwight and Mason, and extensively received,—whilst none in this country, so far as we know, have maintained the particular point to which the objections are chiefly opposed. [See Dwights Theol., serm. 95.]

and one to which the apostle frequently alludes. See Acts 22: 3, 4. Rom. 11: 1. Titus 3: 3. Gal. 4: 12, in the Greek, &c. Comp. Heb. 4: 15, &c.

2. This rendering, it is in effect said, would teach what is clearly opposed to fact and common sense. "Paul, before his conversion, never could have wished himself cut off from Christ, with whom he was never joined."* "Neither he, nor any unbelieving Jew could have expressed his hatred to Jesus Christ, or indifference to his favours, by wishing himself accursed from him; for this would recognize the power of Christ to injure, and the great evil of his displeasure." Or, if with Mr. Barnes we take Christ here to mean *the Messiah*, "Neither Paul, nor any unconverted Jew could have wished to be accursed by the Messiah, however much he might have hated Jesus, regarded as an impostor."

To this objection, on all its varied grounds, it may be replied, that it has no bearing against the exposition we propose. We regard Paul as speaking according to his present convictions of the *tendency* of the conduct of the unbelieving Jews, the same conduct that himself had exhibited before his conversion. His own and their unbelief and prejudice, and their consequent opposition to Jesus, clearly indicated their choice of a course which he now saw was leading to misery, and must forever separate all who persevered in it from the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom. True, they did not directly choose the dreadful result; but they did choose the course that would make the result inevitable. This the apostle now saw:—and seems it strange that he should speak of choosing the fearful end, instead of choosing the means that would certainly produce it? It ought hardly to seem strange to any familiar with scripture language, with that of Paul himself. When Moses would urge on Israel obedience to Jehovah as the means of happiness, and warn them against idolatry and disobedience as leading to inevitable ruin, he does it in this striking language:—"I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore *choose life*." (Duet. 30; 19.) So also we read, "All they that hate me, *love death*,"

* Does the objector really suppose that all, who at last shall be ἀνάσσειν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, were once joined with Christ!

(Prov. 8 : 36,) and again, "He that spareth his rod *hateth his son*" (13: 24), &c.* Now, is it indeed strange that one, like Paul, conversant with such thought and language, should speak of his own rejection of the only Saviour from divine wrath, as a choosing of perdition,—as a wishing to be anathema from Christ? On a certain occasion when Paul and Barnabas found the Jews filled with envy, resisting their doctrine, contradicting and blaspheming, they waxed bold and said, "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and *judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." (Acts 13: 46.) Now in regard to the last particular in the conduct ascribed to the Jews, on the principles of the above objection, we might reason thus: "The statement is evidently opposed to fact and common sense. The Jews, above all others deemed themselves worthy of eternal life, and had they really judged themselves unworthy, they would have rejoiced in the glad tidings of the gospel." In explaining this passage, Mr. Barnes, as every expositor must, answers fully all objection to our method of exegesis.

3. Again it is objected that *ἠΰχόμην* *does not admit* of being rendered "*I did wish*."

This is not explicitly said by Professor Stuart. He only informs us that "he *does* not render it '*I did wish*,' because *ἠΰχόμην*, as here employed '*I could wish*,' implies that whatever his desires may be, *after all* the thing wished for is impossible,—which is doubtless the very shade of thought that the writer would design to express." That is, having *somehow* ascertained *beyond all doubt the very shade of the writer's thought*, he uses this previous knowledge as a guide to explain his words. Others, however, are left to derive the Apostle's meaning, as well as they can, from the language he uses.

Mr. Barnes, indeed, roundly asserts that "the *proper grammatical construction* of the word used here is not "*I did wish*," but *I could* desire, *i. e.* if the thing were possible. It is not *I do* wish, or *did* wish, but *I could* desire (*ἠΰχόμην*), implying that he was willing now to endure it." He gives *repeated* assertion, 'tis true, but no

* On these, with similar and analogous forms, peculiarly frequent among early Hebrews and later Jews, see Glass, Dathe's ed. pp. 240 ss, 832 ss.

proof, no explanation; and we are left to infer that he considers "*could*" as the proper sign of the imperfect indicative; or *ἡχόμεν* as in some other tense and mood. Such a statement it is hard to meet.

Professor Hodge adduces the authority of Noesselt for saying, that if Paul had intended to express this idea, (I did wish,) he would have used the aorist, the common tense of narration, and not the imperfect, *i. e.* *ἡξάμεν ποτὲ*, and not *ἡχόμεν*.* But how Noesselt knew this, neither Noesselt nor the professor informs us. We are left to find the evidence ourselves, and can discover nothing better than the following:—

Matthiæ tells us that "the imperfect differs from the aorist in this, that the aorist marks an action past but transient; the imperfect, an action past, but at that time continuing." § 497.

Buttmann says, "the idea of duration connects itself naturally with the imperfect; and in opposition to this, the idea of something momentary is connected with the aorist." § 137. 4.

Now if the desire ascribed to Paul in his former state be not one no sooner felt than gone, but an abiding one,—to express it he should have used the imperfect, Matthiæ and Buttmann being judges. But our view implies no transient affection, but a continued state of feeling in past time: so far then, the form used by the apostle pleads in our favour. We wish no change.

But by adding *ποτὲ*, did Noesselt mean that if Paul had thus fully expressed the "*once*" or "*formerly*," which we think implied, the tense must have been aorist? Paul himself shall answer, "*Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζηον χωρὶς νόμου ποτὲ*, Rom. 7: 9 . . . *ἦν ποτὲ ἐπὶ ῥῆσι*," Gal. 1: 23, &c. Comp. Rom. 6: 21. &c.

Or did he mean that such continued past action connected with his former state could not be expressed without *ποτὲ*? Again let the apostle speak. *Χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ᾧ ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας* Rom. 6: 17. *Καὶ ταῦτα ἰνὲς ἦτε*, 1 Cor. 6: 11; *Οἱ δαίε*,

* Professor Stuart also, in his second edition, (which we had not consulted till the text of our remarks was finished,) assures us that "If the apostle had designed here merely to describe what he once felt or desired, *i. e.* before his conversion, he would, of course, have employed the aorist of narration, and not the imperfect." We would not say that the apostle "designed here merely to describe," but that he actually declares, what he once wished: and would refer the professor for his further satisfaction to his own Gram. of N. T. § 50 (4), § 125 (3). n 2.

ὅτι ἐθνή ηἴτε, πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλὰ τὰ ἄφωνα, ὡς ἂν ἡγέρσθῃ, ἀπαγόμενοι, 1 Cor. 12: 2, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον . . . καὶ ἐπύρρουν κ. τ. λ. Gal. 1: 13.

Indeed, the apostle seems to have known no better means of expressing the former condition or conduct of believers, as contrasted with the present, than the use of the imperfect tense with or without *ποτέ*. It is also a striking fact that in "Bos's Ellipses" the only remark on this particle is this: "*Ποτέ* is perpetually understood." To which we will only add, that its sense is actually implied in the usual import of the imperfect.

What is alleged against our rendering of *ἡχόμεν* beyond the direct objections already noticed, will appear as we proceed to examine the grounds of the statement in which our three commentators accord, viz: that "the only legitimate construction of *ἡχόμεν* here is '*I could wish*,' expressing a desire resting on a condition known at the time to be utterly impossible."

Professor Hodge briefly states what he calls "the common interpretation and that which seems most natural," in these words: "I am grieved at heart for my brethren, for I could wish myself accursed from Christ; that is, I could be willing to be regarded and treated as anathema, a thing accursed, for their sakes."* He then adds: "That this interpretation suits the force and meaning of the words, and is agreeable to the context, must on all hands be admitted. The only objection to it is of a theological kind." But here the professor is surely too fast. We leave, for the present at least, theological objections to be disposed of by others as they can best agree. We are inclined to join issue on grounds of philology.

It is conceded by both of our professors, and seems intended as an argument, that no other form of the verb *ἐύχομαι* would express the thought for which they contend:—but this, if a fact, is surely no evidence that the imperfect *does* express the thought.† Tholuck, however, as quoted by

* How the Professor gets support of his views from the quotation he here adduces from Bengel, he does not explain. The passage, as quoted, is this:

"Sensus est: Optabam Judæorum miseriam in meum caput conferre et illorum loco esse. Judæi fidem repudiantes *erant* anathema a Christo."

† If, not only the Greek, but every other language were destitute of a peculiar form of verb for expressing what a man *could wish on a condition utterly impossible*, we should not regard it a matter of much regret. We have enough to do in regulating our wishes and conduct in actual, at least in possible cases, without inquiring what we *could wish* under impossibilities.

Professor Hodge, informs us that "the imperfect of the indicative expresses exactly the impossibility of that for which one wishes." And Professor Hodge says, "the proper force of the imperfect indicative, when thus used, implies the presence of a condition which is known to be impossible." What is here meant by the phrase, "*when thus used*," is not very clear ;—but, from what he quotes joined with what he says, we conclude that the Professor takes this position, that "verbs of *wishing* when used in the imperfect imply an impossible condition." But may not the imperfect of such verbs have its ordinary import, and express a continued wish in past time? If not, this would indeed be a strange anomaly of language. But let us consult facts in the case.

The verb εὐχόμεαι is employed in the imperfect only once more in the N. T. viz : Acts 27 : 29,—*οὐχ ἔτι ἡμέραν γενέσθαι*. And here the historian certainly does not mean that the sailors "*could* wish for day, but, knowing it impossible that it should come, *do* not." It is plainly a simple narration of an event passing in past time:—they wished the day to come, hoping and expecting its arrival.

Of other verbs of wishing the most prominent are βούλομαι, and θέλω or εθέλω.

Of βούλομαι we have an instance of the imperfect Acts 25 : 22. Since much reliance has been placed on this passage as the strongest, we may suppose, that can be found, and as decisive of the question at issue,—that we may not be suspected of mistaking or misstating the evidence that it furnishes, we give it in the words of Professor Stuart (Gram. of N. T. p. 189 n. 1.)

"To illustrate the *conditional* usage of the imperf. Ind., *i. e.* the *modified* sense of it,* Acts 25 : 22, may be taken as an example ; viz : ἐξουκλήμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνδρώπου ἀκοῦσαι, *I my-*

* The remark designed to be illustrated by the quotation in our text, is thus expressed by Professor Stuart :

"The imperfect Indicative is sometimes employed in a *conditional* way, not unlike the Conditional or Subjunctive mood."

We do not dispute the fact. But does it furnish ground for a rule applicable *ad libitum*, and to verbs of any and every class ?

So far as we can discover Matthiæ admits such meaning of the imperfect (unless with the particles *άν, εἰ, εἰθε, ἵνα* &c.) only in a particular employment of the verbs *χρῆν, εἶπε, προσήκε* and *ὀφείλον* (§ 505 obs. 2), and a somewhat analogous use of *ἦν* (§ 508 obs. 2.) Nor do we conceive that any of the examples furnished by the professor justifies its extension.

self could wish to hear the man; which means, that although he was desirous to hear him, yet in his view present circumstances forbade it. Had he simply said [meant?] *I desire to hear him*, or *I will hear him*, without any qualification or limitation, he would have used ἐούλωμαι or θέλω. Had he spoken optatively (ἐβουλόμην [ἐβουλοίμην ?] ἄν), then the possibility or probability that he should hear him, would have been distinctly intimated. It was only the indicative imperfect, therefore, which would answer the exact purpose of the speaker."

Here, again, the professor seems to have the singular advantage of being directed in his interpretation by his previous knowledge of *the exact purpose* of the speaker. But possibly, in this instance, the advantage is only apparent.

What *present circumstances* those were which forbade all hope to Agrippa of hearing Paul, the professor has not told us. All the circumstances mentioned by the historian were plainly calculated to excite hope, expectation, and confidence too, if the king had any wish of the kind. Felix, his friend, whom he knew to have the power to grant such hearing, was at this very moment manifesting a desire to gratify his wishes in every way, and especially on the matters of Paul, in which he was seeking counsel from the king. If a writer's words can ever give safe ground for judging of his design, the impossibility, for which the professor pleads, seems here to have no place.

In the interpretation of language it has commonly been thought a safe rule, not to resort to an unusual and *modified* sense of words or forms, when their ordinary and proper import furnishes a better meaning. This passage, we cannot but think, furnishes an apt illustration. "I myself," said Agrippa, "was wishing to hear the man." "Tomorrow" said Felix, "thou shalt hear him." As we might have expected, there was no impossibility, no difficulty in the way,—all was easy. And so appears to us the meaning of the language if permitted to speak for itself.

Another example of the imperfect of this verb is found. Philmon: 13, ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν κατέχευ. Nothing here prevents our taking the proper sense of the imperfect, "whom I wished to retain with me." No impossibility of doing or of wishing the thing, is implied. All the other instances in the N. T. of ἐούλωμαι in the imperfect

have the sense of purposing rather than of wishing, and exhibit the customary import of the tense.

There are many examples in the New Testament of the imperfect of the verb θέλω or ἐθέλω, in the sense of wishing, but they need not detain us long. We notice one on account of its near resemblance to the wishing by Agrippa above considered. ὁ δὲ ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν, ἦν γὰρ θέλων [—ἡθέλει] ἐξ ἱκανοῦ ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν, διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν πολλὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. Luke 23: 8.—All the remaining instances accord with this in presenting the appropriate force of the tense, unless we must admit one exception adduced by Professor Stuart and others to sustain their views. It is found Gal.

4: 20, ἠθέλον ὁδὲ παρῆναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι. And what prevents our taking the verb here in its proper import: "I wished to be present with you now?" The apostle, in months back, might have wished to be now among the Galatians. Circumstances may prevent the accomplishment of a wish in itself possible: and it is certainly possible to have wished what we were prevented from doing, or what we relinquished against much of wish and desire.

But should we yield, without evidence, what most of our opponents are disposed to claim; that any, or all of the examples of the imperfect they adduce, are to be treated not as simple imperfects, but as instances where ἂν with its *potential* force is to be supplied;—even then, it is questionable whether any legitimate rendering would subvert their cause. On this point, however, we will not overlook the authority of Matthiæ as given in the sections to which Professor Hodge has referred us.

In § 509, Matthiæ says, "The indicative of all tenses is frequently used with ἂν, *without any condition implied*, where in Latin the conjunctive is used." And he further informs us that in such cases "the imperfect shows an incident then happening, and accompanying the circumstances of that [past] time;"—or, "a continuation to the present time of an action begun in past time." He then subjoins: "Thus especially ἐβουλόμην ἂν, ἡθέλον ἂν is used, I could *have* wished, not only now, but also previously, *vellem*, whence it follows that as being passed it can no longer be effected. On the other hand, εἰβουλόμην ἂν, 'I now could wish,' as something present and future, consequently still possible, *velim*.—Without such a reference, as a real wish we find ἐβουλόμην without ἂν."

This testimony, to which Professor Hodge has directed us, is truly surprising. Let us deliberately review the points it seems to establish.

1. The imperfect Indicative of verbs of wishing without *ἄν*, is employed to express a real wish.
2. The imperfect of such verbs with *ἄν* is used without *any condition implied*.
3. It is so used with special frequency in the sense "I could have wished," referring to past time terminated by the present,—and *therefore* to what can no longer be effected.
4. Would one express "I could now wish," as something present and future, *consequently* still possible, the optative form would be requisite.

In brief, Matthiæ tells us that the legitimate sense of ἐβουλόμην, [ἤυχομην,] ἤθελον, is, I did actually wish,—of ἐβουλόμην *ἄν*, &c. I could hitherto have wished, and of ἐβουλόμην *ἄν*, &c. I could now wish.

Hence we may safely conclude, so far as the authority of Matthiæ may be trusted, that the verb employed by the apostle, Rom. 9: 3, is in the appropriate form to express an actual wish in past time, "I did once wish," precisely as we had supposed:—

That if we should attempt to improve the language of the apostle by adding *ἄν* it would not *then* imply any condition whatever, much less a necessarily impossible condition: it would not express any present wish, or present readiness or desire to wish;—but, referring exclusively to antecedent time, would forbid the idea of present desire. "I could *have* wished":

That if the idea "I could now wish" were intended, the proper form would be εὐχοίμην *ἄν*, and then would regard a thing present or future, and *consequently* possible.

Thus much for this appeal to Matthiæ. None perhaps have been more *disappointed* at the result than ourselves: yet out of respect both to Professor Hodge and to Matthiæ, we will not question the correctness of the decision.—It would seem then, that we must come to the conclusion that the imperfect of verbs of wishing, with or without *ἄν*, does not imply any impossible condition, or any condition whatever.

Yet we are assured, again and again, that the language of the text in question is *evidently* hypothetical, and that too, on an impossible condition:—and as if the expression

of Paul had actually been in this or like form, *Εἰ εἶδον ἢ ἤν ἡνυχόμεν ἂν ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Prof. Hodge refers us to Matthiæ, § 508, and to others, to prove, as we must conclude, that *such* a hypothetical proposition would mean "If it were possible, I could *now* wish, &c."

We might proceed to shew that it is the object of Matthiæ, in the section here adduced, to establish by a multitude of examples, a rule respecting *such propositions*, [viz: where *εἰ* in the protasis, and *ἂν* in the apodosis are joined with the imperfect,] which would demand this rendering, "Had it been possible, I could *have* wished;" referring to past time:—that he further decides, that where the writer has actually omitted *ἂν* in the apodosis, the inference must be considered absolute, and the protasis or condition must be taken as an assumed fact; "If it *was* possible, I *did* wish, &c."

But on these points there is not a perfect agreement among the Greek masters; while the uniformity which they would settle each in his own way, seems met by diversity in actual usage. And we may surely be excused from involving ourselves in one of the most complicated and dubious questions that has exercised the ingenuity and patience of German grammarians,—and this in order to our settling what *would have been* the proper force of particles in a situation where they are not found,—or the sense of a construction which our author does not exhibit. Whilst the language of the apostle, as it stands, presents an easy and appropriate meaning; we feel justified in protesting against all gratuitous supplies, and especially such as would utterly change the grammatical import of what he actually wrote, and darken what is already plain.

Leaving *ἡνυχόμεν*, we proceed to *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*. That the adjective *αὐτὸς*, thus joined to its noun or person, has an emphatic power, all admit: and those who adopt the views which we decline, have generally shewn a desire to secure this emphasis to the subject of the following infinitive, "I could wish that *myself* were anathema."* Noesselt and others have contended that such construction is grammatically correct, and required by the antithesis, of *ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν μου*. But as we perceive no evidence of such antithesis, we simply inquire after the grammatical usage. Buttmann

* Prof. Stuart seems an exception.

teaches that "when a writer thinks proper to insert the *personal* pronoun before an infinitive, it is put of course in the *accusative*, notwithstanding the corresponding nominative of the preceding verb," §142. 4. n 2. With this Prof. Stuart accords (Gram. of N. T. p. 212); "Where the subject of the infinitive and of the preceding verb is one and the same, it is not usual to repeat it before the infinitive. Yet where emphasis is demanded, the subject may be repeated, and *then it is put in the accusative case*.—Phil. 3: 13, ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογιζομαι κατεσθληνέναι." Comp. Rom. 2: 19, 6: 11, &c.

Αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, therefore, though certainly emphatic, must abide the nominative of *ἠύχομην*;* and if ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν requires antithetic emphasis in the subject of εἶναι, it can be secured only by the insertion of ἑμαυτὸν. Then, indeed, we might read, "I myself did wish that myself were anathema."

But for ourselves we are better pleased with the words of Paul as we find them, and with the construction that the grammarians require. Objections to our view, on examination, conspire in its support. We wished the nominative of *ἠύχομην* to be emphatic, and it proves to be so irrevocably:—we need no emphasis to the subject of the infinitive, and none is to be found. In short, the grammarians fully sustain the exposition we had proposed: "I myself (I too, as my brethren do now,) *did* wish to be anathema."

Noesselt objects to uniting ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν with καρδία μου, and thus leaving the wish in parenthesis, on the ground that this would exhibit Paul as writing interruptedly and confusedly, when he might easily have avoided it by placing ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν immediately after καρδία μου.

Every parenthesis, it is true, somewhat disturbs the connexion: yet Paul abounds in parenthesis. And in such cases we should never discover the real connexion of his thought, without a regard to the fact of a parenthesis. In the present instance, if Paul intended what we think his

* Even if we should adopt the arrangement exhibited in some MSS. which place αὐτὸς ἐγὼ after ἀνάστημα εἶναι, it would not help the matter whatever Noesselt may have thought. Εἶναι would still require the accusative of its subject [See Acts 5: 36, 8: 9], and αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, though further removed from its verb [Comp. Rom. 15: 14], would remain the subject of *ἠύχομην*.

language means, we can scarcely imagine how he could have expressed it, with the same connected thoughts, more naturally in so many words. No sooner does he announce his deep and abiding sorrow, than he assigns, in few words, a reason for its intensity; reserving the mention of the persons who were its objects, because, when made, it would be joined with a fuller description, extending, as we see, through the two subsequent verses.*

To others it may seem a fond fancy, but we are ready to confess, that the alleged interruption seems to us so characteristic of Paul, as rather to commend the interpretation which admits it.

The parenthesis is essential in the view we have maintained, and leaves no room for various objections which have been made against other schemes in which *ἡ νόχον* may also have been rendered as an ordinary imperfect. Thus Noesselt objects, that "it would be frigid to adjure the Romans with such solemn and unusual obtestation, to believe that Paul had formerly been a violent enemy of Jesus Christ," &c.: and adds, what has been often repeated, that "the expression here of his former love to the Jews would be nothing to his present purpose." Now, no one, regarding the parenthesis, will for a moment suppose that our exegesis is liable to these objections.

It is the deep Christian solicitude for the eternal interests of his Jewish brethren, felt by the apostle whilst he wrote, in attestation of which he so solemnly avers. And should his language be interpreted as a formal and deliberate oath, the occasion might well justify the full import of his self-adjuration. The malice of his unbelieving countrymen toward him was well known to all,—from it he had suffered much,—and many would readily infer that his feelings in return could hardly be those of kindness, at least, how could he yearn over those who execrated, and were ready to destroy him! But further, and chiefly, his doctrine throughout this epistle had been directly opposed to exclusive claims and self-preferences still indulged by many even of the Christian Jews; and what he was about yet to say, would still more offend these national prejudices. He

* If any one is still scrupulous of admitting a parenthesis here, through fear of injuring the character of Paul's style, we would only ask him to read, as one specimen out of many, the first seven verses of this epistle.

would not withhold the requisite truth, but he would aim to conciliate a candid hearing: he needed all their confidence, and this could be hoped, only from their firm persuasion of his tender concern and deepest sympathy for his people. Hence his solemn asseveration,—and we can scarcely imagine how it could have been more in season. Had we represented the apostle's readiness to make an impossible or unlawful wish, knowing it to be so,—as the greatest evidence he could give of his wonderful affection for his brethren, we perhaps should be chargeable with ascribing to him something frigid and out of place.*

It is obvious to remark that our three commentators, and those who have preceded them in their general scheme of exegesis, all unite in *assuming* the idea "*such is my love for my brethren*," and this they insert before coming to *ἐὺχόμενον*. This idea is indeed essential to their view; but where do they find it? The apostle's words express only deep sorrow; and the cause or objects of this sorrow, according to their plan of construction, he does not name at all. Without this new and strange supply in addition to all the rest, we might be left to conclude,—and in this conclusion we should be sustained by the ordinary import of *γὰρ*,—that Paul's sorrow arose from his wishing, or being willing to wish if it were possible, a thing that he knew to be impossible, or wrong if it were possible, and so after all not really wishing at all: or, it may be, that he was sorry from finding himself talking he knew not what† . . . and in

* At least thus thought Noesselt: and surely we may be excused for borrowing one arrow of defence from the quiver that has furnished all the shafts against us. In remarking on the wish of Paul he says: "Though by far the greater part of interpreters incline to the opinion, that Paul expressed a wish for his own eternal destruction, or exclusion from the society of Christ, provided in this way the Jews might be united to Christ,—and to avoid what seems harsh, and utterly unworthy of a Christian or an apostle, in this sentiment would soften it by saying, *either*, that Paul spake with the reservation, 'if the law of self-love or Christian precept allowed it,'—*or* that he used hyperbole, or spake under the influence of strong emotion:—yet they do not seem to have been sensible that in this very way they denied and controverted, if not the holiness and divine wisdom, at least the great love of the apostle. For, to be willing to choose what you admit that, as a good man, you must not choose,—what else is it, than *not* to be willing to choose what you *would* be willing to choose, and thus to contradict the asseveration of your highest love." *Opuscula I. pp. 150—1. (A. D. 1761.)*

† See Professor Hodge, p. 374, text, and last note.

either case it might be difficult to prove his sorrow unreasonable.

On what remains a few words shall suffice.

By ἀνάθεμα, we understand an object execrated, devoted, excluded from what is holy or happy.

By ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *away from Christ, far from his presence.** Not *by* Christ, as the agent of inflicting the curse or ruin : for, besides other reasons, we think there is some difference between ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, and ἀνάθεμα ἀνατίθεσθαι or ἀναθεματίζεισθαι,—between *being* an anathema, *being made* or *pronounced* an anathema ; that the latter would readily take ἀπὸ (for ὑπὸ) *by*, indicating the agent, but not so the former.†

Ἀπὸ, in the sense *away from, far from*, is of frequent recurrence in the classics, and not without examples in the N. T. An instance, strikingly similar in thought to this in Romans, is found 2 Thes. 1 : 9, as explained by some of the first critical commentators : “Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction *from* (ἀπὸ, away from, far from,) the presence of the Lord.”

The parenthesis connecting its parts, would therefore read thus : “For I too did once wish to be an execrated object, far off from Christ.”

How this declaration is to be understood, we have already endeavoured to show.

* Professor Stuart in his second edition seems inclining to this.

† In this opinion we find ourselves sustained by Koppe, *in loco*.

ART. II. ROTATION IN THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

By HEMAN HUMPHREY, D.D. Prest. of Amherst College.

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the way and see, and ask for the old paths, and where is the good way, and walk therein; and ye shall find rest to your souls.—JEREMIAH.

HAD this divine command, or exhortation, been given with special reference to the period of the nineteenth century in which we live, it could scarcely have been more timely—for “the foundations of the earth were seldom getting faster out of course.” The exhortation covers the whole ground of those venturesome and perilous innovations, over which thousands of good men now mourn, and many are beginning almost to despair. But we shall confine our remarks, in this article, to the rise and progress of one of these innovations, upon the ancient order of things, which is threatening to unsettle the Christian ministry, and leave the churches “as sheep without a shepherd.”

The brief and fluctuating existence of Pastoral relations in this country, at the present time, compared with their former sacredness and permanence, affords ground for the most painful and alarming anticipations. This is the proposition which we shall attempt to prove and illustrate. That a great change has taken place, within these few years, and that it is still working out its results, is “known and read of all men.” Formerly, and especially in New England, the settlement of a minister was an important event in the history of a town; and the preparatory steps were most deliberately taken. The vacant pulpit was first supplied by the members of the association, in turn, for the benefit of the deceased pastor’s family, and then a young candidate, “of good report,” was invited to preach, from two to four months, on probation. The object of this was, to give the church and congregation ample time, not only to judge of his pulpit talents, but to hear his week-day lectures in the school-house—to meet him in the sick chamber, and at funerals, and to see and become acquainted with him in their own families. They expected, that during this probation, he would preach on all the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, and tell them just what he believed, that they might know how they were to be

fed, should he ever be placed "over them in the Lord." If they were satisfied, they made out a call, which was preceded by a day of solemn fasting and prayer. When the call was accepted, and the day of ordination fixed, it was anticipated with thrilling interest, not only in the town itself, but in all the vicinity; and it brought along with it a great convocation. Hundreds assembled, who had never witnessed the solemnities of an ordination in their lives; and the consecration was made with fasting, as well as prayer and the laying on of hands. In short, it was a great day. The church and people regarded the relation as sacred and permanent. Those who, like the pastor himself, were rising into life, expected to sit under his ministry all their days; and the aged thought of nothing else, but that their children's children, would rise up around him and "call him blessed." On his part there was the same expectation. He had come, as he hoped, to live and die, and be buried among them; and he made all his arrangements accordingly. If his salary was small, it was sure and permanent. If constrained by sickness to intermit his labours for a few weeks, or months, his desk was supplied without his care, or expense; and when he was worn out in the service, instead of being turned off, to beg the rest of his way down to the grave, his little salary still went on. As soon as it could be conveniently done, a colleague was brought in and settled, "as a son with a father." The aged heard his voice to the last with great delight, and the young rose up before his gray hairs. He went to his rest in peace, and "devout men carried him to his burial." Such was once the sacredness and the permanence of pastoral relations in this country. Nay, such are the recollections of the present generation.

But of all the changing things, in this changing world, what is now more fluctuating than the sacred ministry? What other class of men are so *unsettled* as ministers of the gospel? How hastily is the connexion formed, and on what slight grounds is it dissolved. So far from preaching three or four months, on probation, as their fathers did, young men will now hardly consent to supply *three or four Sabbaths*. And instead of contemplating a permanent settlement, when they call a candidate, parishes now-a-days insist upon inserting a clause, by which he may be warned off, or may warn them that he is going off, at three or six

months notice. Or if, as often happens, a congregation fix their eyes upon a settled minister, whom they have never heard, the fashion is, to make out a call at a venture; or to save appearances, perhaps, the way is prepared by privately sending a committee to hear him, not only for themselves, but for all their brethren. Who now witnesses an ordination for the first time; and where will you find that awful solemnity which used to pervade the great congregation, when a new minister was settled, only once in half, or a quarter of a century? And how can ordaining councils, called as they are, almost every month, within the circuit of every twenty miles, feel the same responsibility as they formerly did? When the cold every-day ceremony is over, what room is there for those mutual congratulations which used to be so delightful? Strangely out of place would they be, in the present state of things. The pastor who has just been settled, with so much unanimity, may be called, or driven away in a year, or even six months, and then the same ground is to be gone over again, and with the same discouraging prospects. He knows how precarious his standing is. The slightest stroke may sever the tie that binds him to his people. He is a sort of *minute* man, liable to be sent away, as well *without* reason, as with reason. Under such circumstances, how can he hope to spend more than a few years in any one place? The prospect of becoming old, and dying in the midst of an affectionate congregation, and lying down in the grave among them, and rising with them at the last day, is growing fainter and fainter continually. The probabilities are altogether against his being connected with *any* people during the last years of his life, especially if he outlives his active usefulness. He is ordained and dismissed: then reinstalled and dismissed again, and then hired by the year, or month, till nobody will hear him any longer, and so he finishes his course. This is the *new* way. This is becoming more and more the religious fashion in New England, as well as else where; and it is thought by some to be a great improvement. It puts both parties, they say, upon their good behaviour, and allows them to do better if they can. The people are not *doomed*, as formerly, to sit from year to year under a dull and unprofitable ministry. When the incumbent ceases to be useful, they can send him away, and call a more popular man. And so on the other hand, if he becomes discontented, or sees a wider field of useful-

ness open somewhere else, he is not *bound*. He can leave when he pleases. Entering a new parish, he carries a stock of experience, as well as of sermons along with him, and this is a great advantage. He can do more, and do it better, than if he had remained at his old station, for he has more time for the thorough investigation of difficult subjects, and for pastoral duties, and will be more apt to make those efforts which are essential to eminence in his profession! Thus they reason. Now that there may be some advantages in pastoral rotation, I am not disposed to deny—for what innovation is there, in favour of which *nothing* can be said? It is possible, that under the old order of things, some few ministers may have been less active and laborious, than they would have been under the present system. Now and then one might have done more for Christ and the church, by leaving a narrow sphere, and entering a wider one. But in comparing any two systems, *general* results, and not *particular* cases, are to be looked at. Which is best, *upon the whole*?

In our pastoral relations and habits, which are the safest, the old paths, or the new? We have tried them both.—We have had a permanent ministry, and now we have one which is “as the waves of the sea, driven of the winds and tossed.” Has the cause of religion gained or lost by the change? Many of us have been on the stage long enough to witness the whole transition, and to mark some of the results. What are they, and what are they likely to be in the more full development, which is now in progress.

In the first place, let us enquire, how ministers themselves are likely to be affected, by the new system? Is its tendency to make them more able, more faithful and more useful, or the contrary? A young man who has finished his preparatory studies, receives a call to the pastoral office. This brings a solemn question of duty before his mind. Is the field to which he is invited such an one, as he ought to enter? Are the people so well united in him, as to afford the prospect of a quiet and successful ministry? Were it to be a permanent location, he would send in his negative at once. But he looks at the six months warning, provided for in the call, and says, “I shall not be bound to stay long, if I settle, nor is it expected by the people that I should. I may do some good for the present, and in the mean time, I can be looking out for a better parish, as the congregation

will no doubt be looking out for a better minister." So he accepts the call, and is inducted into the sacred office, with the usual ceremonies. But as it was with the children of Israel, when they ate the passover in Egypt, "with their loins girded, and their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand," so it is with him. He is *ordained*, but not *settled*; he is *stationed*, but not at *home*. So far as he makes any calculations for the future, it must be with reference to some other place; for however faithful he may be, he is liable to be notified, at any moment, that his services are no longer needed. Under these circumstances, what arrangements can you expect him to make? If he builds a house who will take it off from his hands, when he comes to be warned off? If he plants trees, who will sit under the shade and eat the fruit of them? He comes a stranger, and he cannot feel otherwise while he remains. Things may go on smoothly for a while, but the seeds of discontent, which were sown when the contract was made, are insensibly taking root. The people do not like him so well as they expected, and begin to enquire how they may get rid of him; or he thinks he would do more good some where else; and the constant liability of being sent away, makes him jealous and uneasy. He sees a better parish and secretly wishes for a call.

Now can you blame him for anticipating your own movements? You may say, that his suspicions are groundless; that he is well off, and ought to go quietly on with his work, and it may all be very true. But you reap as you sowed. You both agreed, in the conditions of the settlement, to make the connection as precarious as possible. He goes on for a year or two, and then at his own motion, or yours, no matter which, he is dismissed. Once, the reason of his leaving, or being sent away, would have been loudly demanded by the christian public, and this responsibility, would have restrained fickleness and discontent, on both sides. But now these changes have become so common, that nobody thinks of asking for reasons.

In a year, perhaps, he is once more reinstalled, but still he feels that he has no home. Whenever he is nervous, the anticipated *warning* rings in his ears. The advantage which he hoped to gain, by having more time for study, he does not realize. In three cases out of four, probably he studies less, and for this, among other reasons, he finds,

that with the help of his manuscripts, less study is now necessary. Of course, he does not distinguish himself in his new situation, as his friends expected he would, and as he intended ; and this makes him unhappy. Again he is dismissed, and possibly after another interval of a year, or two, finds a new parish and once more goes through the ceremony of installation, but with still fainter prospect of either permanence, or usefulness. How many such changes he may pass through in twenty years, it is impossible to predict, but at length, the last slender tie is broken, and he is virtually turned out of the pastoral office. Thus cast off and disappointed in the decline of life, how little good can he do, compared with what he might have accomplished, had he spent his prime, maturity and latest strength, in the midst of an affectionate church and congregation. These remarks, undoubtedly admit of exceptions. Some men have a natural force of character, which bears them on through every change, to extraordinary efforts and high attainments ; and the popular system of rotation increases their usefulness. But these are exceptions to the general rule. It does not, we are sure, admit of a rational doubt that other things being equal, a permanent ministry will always be far more able and respectable and influential, than one that is given to change. The great laws of nature, and the wise arrangements of Providence cannot be repealed. By often transplanting a shrub, or a tree, you inevitably retard its growth. Even when you remove it to a better soil, so many tendrils are broken in taking it up, that it often looses much more than it gains by the transplantation. It rarely grows so large, or stretches its arms so wide as it would have done had you let it alone. So the man that often breaks up his establishment, and removes from place to place, is almost sure to suffer by it. No farmer can safely sell out, once in two or three years, and plant himself down somewhere else, upon a soil that is new to him. One in twenty may better his circumstances by frequent removals, but the great majority are sure to repent it. So it is in the trades and mechanic arts. Men must not only continue in those which they have learned, but they must have *permanent* locations, or in general they will not prosper. The same thing is true in merchandize. Here and there, an individual may transfer the seat of his business from the country to the city, and then from one city to another,

and increase the value of his property by every removal. But what if such frequent changes were to become fashionable and general among our respectable merchants? Would it be for their advantage, or the contrary? Now what is true upon the farm, in the shop, and in the counting-house, is true in the desk. The principle is the same. The present system of removals, if it goes on, will, we are persuaded, be as hostile to the intellectual and professional improvement of ministers, as it would be in the case of business men, were it to be extended in the same manner to them.

A second objection to the rotatory system, and one which in our view has great weight, is, that, *it exceedingly diminishes the amount of personal influence in the sacred profession.* This may be made quite clear, by a few remarks and a little reflection. It is but a little that any man can do, by his own immediate efforts, to sway the public mind, independently of the estimation in which he is held. It is the *established character*, it is the *influence* of those who are most eminently useful in the church and the world, that does incomparably more, than all their personal labours—than all their instructions, arguments and persuasions put together. Taking away their influence, is like depriving Sampson of his locks. But influence is not like sensation, one of the natural attributes of man. He is not born with it. It is gradually and slowly acquired. A person must be *known*, must be seen every day, must be tried in a great variety of circumstances, and their must be ample time for the developement of his character, before we feel safe in confiding in him. And though great talents are always admired and extolled, they are much less essential to a man's usefulness than is generally supposed. It is moral character—it is stern integrity,—it is deep seated religious principle,—it is kindness—it is love—it is disinterested benevolence, that does far more, than the most brilliant intellectual powers and attainments.

We are all of us acquainted with men, of no more than ordinary talents and acquirements, who have a surprising influence, just as far as they are known; whose benevolence is admired—whose characters are revered—whose opinions are law—and who do infinitely more good than mere intellect, or learning, could ever accomplish. There have been such ministers in every age of the church.

And how have they acquired their influence? Not, we will venture to say, by frequent removals; but by faithful labours, for many years, in the same field—by having ample time to become acquainted with the character and religious wants of their people—to extend their acquaintance in all the neighbouring parishes, and to gain that public confidence, which not only gave them the title of fathers in the church, but secured to them the love and reverence which that title imports. Now just compare the new order of things with this, and mark the difference. A young man of respectable talents and fair prospects, receives a call, and is ordained. He has nothing but his talents and piety to begin with. His reputation as a minister and a Christian, is yet to be acquired. He enters upon his work, and is soon known and respected. His prospects brighten every month, his influence begins to be felt, (in a narrow circle to be sure,) but that circle is all the while extending. Many eyes are turned towards him, and many hearts begin to trust in him. All the developments of his character are favourable, and the prospect is, that in a few years he will stand high in public estimation. But those few years, alas, are not to be granted him. He is suddenly arrested by the six months warning, or he is called away by another congregation, and leaves behind him most of the advantages for doing good, which his being known and respected gave him. Again he is settled, or rather *located*; but it is almost like beginning his work anew. He is a stranger, and how can he exert that influence which years of acquaintance alone can give? Before he has time to make himself known, in his new location, and to shew what he is, and what he could do, another warning comes, and he must go. Thus he removes so often, that it is impossible for him ever to gain that personal influence, and take that high and venerable standing in the church, which the fathers did. Gray hairs are upon him, but how can he be looked up to and revered, as if he had been in one desk half a century? This, then, is one of the great evils which the new system of rotation involves—the loss of a vast amount of ministerial influence, which it scatters to the four winds, as fast as it can be accumulated.

But if the ministry suffers exceedingly in every way under the operation of this system, as I think I have fully proved, the *churches suffer still more grievously*; and this

is the point to which, in the *third* place, we wish to call the serious attention of our readers. Under the ancient order of things, when a congregation were united in a candidate, and had settled him, they felt free and easy. They had accomplished a great object. They looked upon the man of their choice as *their* minister. He had come to live and die among them. They had given him their pledge of support, and now they gave him their hearts. They felt that they could do it safely; for nothing but death was likely ever to remove him. They had no suspicion, either that in a few years he would become discontented, and want to leave them; or that some two or three restless spirits, would try to raise a party and drive him away, for he was beyond their reach. If he rose in public estimation, they rejoiced in it, and considered themselves honoured by it. They spoke of his talents and labours freely every where, for they were not afraid that some other parish would overhear them, and covet and call him away. They had chosen him for their spiritual guide and teacher, and they had no thought of deserting their leader. They honoured him as a pastor, they loved him as a friend, they confided in him as a counsellor, and as he advanced in years, they revered him as a father. When they saw his gray hairs, and feeble step, and heard his trembling voice, it did not lead them to ask, how shall we get rid of him, but where shall we find a colleague. His public labours they would gladly have enjoyed still longer, but when deprived of these, they thought it a great blessing that they might still have the benefit of his counsels and his prayers.

I do not mean that there were no exceptions, but that these were the general views and feelings of every respectable congregation. But how is it now, in this so much vaunted age of new discoveries and improvements? When the ordaining council leaves town, the congregation have got a minister for *three, or six months*, if they insist upon holding him to the contract, and beyond that, they have no claim. He appears well, and they wish to love him; but they dare not. They remember the pangs of recent separation, and their hearts have bled so often, under similar disruptions, that you cannot blame them. If, however, he gradually steals their affections, as he is very likely to do, then they tremble at the shaking of every leaf. The

presence of two or three respectable strangers on the Sabbath alarms them; for how do they know but it is a committee, sent to rob them of their pastor. If he is devoted to his work, and promises to be eminently useful, and begins to be spoken of as a man of piety and talents, it gives them more pain than pleasure; for every thing that can be said in his favour, only increases the probability of losing him. Under other circumstances, they would be delighted with his able and eloquent sermons, and would be glad to have him preach them in other congregations, but how can they, when it is these very sermons that expose them to the greatest dangers? Thus, by having a pastor whom they ought to love, and whom they cannot help loving, they are kept in a state of continual suspense and alarm. Even if he remains with them for many years, they never feel safe and happy, because they can never forget their liability to lose so great a blessing, from the most trivial cause. How often do we hear desponding remarks like the following:—"I was exceedingly attached to my first minister, and when he was torn away, I transferred my affections to his successor, as well as my bleeding heart would permit, but now he is about to be removed in like manner, and I am determined never to love another, for I cannot have my heart broken any more."

Another crying evil of the new system is, that it puts it in the power of a few persons, and some times of a single individual, to agitate a whole church, and ultimately drive away the minister, however useful he may be, and however desirous of remaining.

Formerly, when settlements were understood to be permanent, such attempts were hopeless, and therefore they were seldom made. *Now* they are extremely common, and so deplorably successful, that the loss of pastoral labour and influence in our churches, from this single cause, is incalculable. Any system which subjects the minority to the caprices of a small number of restless and unreasonable men, must be disastrous in its results. It will make a thousand vacancies, which otherwise would never have occurred; and it will never be known, till the day of judgment, how much a congregation loses in a single year, by being without a settled pastor.

Again, the growing instability of pastoral relations in this country, *deprives our churches of half the benefits of*

the ministry while they have it. In order to do good, on a large and comprehensive scale, a pastor must have time and scope to lay his plans, and to carry them out to their remote, as well as their more immediate results. When he knows that wheels are under his house, he will naturally feel constrained to do every thing for present effect. Were he to commence a systematical course of sermons, upon the fundamental doctrines of the gospel—or should he begin to “expound the scriptures in order” to his people, he feels that it is quite uncertain whether he can stay long enough to finish either; and this discourages him; and so the congregation is never thoroughly instructed. No one can tell how much churches suffer from short and precarious settlements, even while they are nominally supplied. And I may remark in general, that the disadvantages of ministers and congregations under the new system, are to a great extent reciprocal. If the former feel themselves so unsettled, that they can neither study, nor do any thing else, as they might and would under more favourable circumstances, the latter lose all those better services and investigations. Or to express it in a single word, *a lean minister makes a lean people.*

Another objection to the new system is, *that it leaves churches without pastors a great part of the time.* If, in some cases, the vacancies which it creates are supplied in a few months, in others they continue for years. We can not speak positively, because we are not in possession of all the necessary data; but our belief is, that even in New England the proportion is as three to one against the six months plan: that is, we believe that there are now four years' vacancy in the churches that have come into it, where there was one under the old and settled order of things. And who will undertake to estimate the loss which parishes sustain, by being so often, and so long left vacant?

Finally; the direct tendency of the rotatory system is, to break up a settled ministry altogether. And it needs but little observation to see, that it is bringing us to this result with a fearful rapidity. It has advanced so far already, in some parts of our country, that a great majority of the churches are without pastors, having only stated, or occasional supplies. To give a single example:—In two counties of Ohio, bordering upon Lake Erie, and containing about thirty Presbyterian congregations, there are, at this

moment, but *three* settled ministers ; and only one of these has been in his place, more than four months. The churches, of course, depend almost wholly upon stated supplies. One of the ministers in that district, has removed *nineteen times* in twelve years! We have reason for devout thanksgiving that it has not yet come to this in the old States ; but who can tell how soon it may? Nay, who can help seeing that it *must* soon come to this, if things go on in their present course? Are not vacancies multiplying every year, and becoming more and more protracted? If we are not greatly mistaken, the plan of stated supplies, as it is technically styled, or hiring by the year, or six months, in plain English, is gaining advocates every day in the land of the Pilgrims. There are thousands of people who have become so discouraged by the process of settling and unsettling ministers, that they are unwilling to make any further efforts. They say it does no good, and they are in favour of hiring. And can the churches prosper under such a system as this? Can we adopt it as a substitute for the divine arrangement, and expect the blessing of God upon so great an innovation? We do not believe that any plan, like that which is now in vogue, of ordaining, installing, calling away, and dismissing ministers, ever succeeded, or ever will. Its direct tendency is to ruin the ministry, and to ruin the churches. Whoever may live to see stated supplies, or no supplies at all, in the room of settled pastors, (and that day cannot be far off, if there is any truth in the signs of the times ;) but whoever may live to see it, will see, that "the glory has departed from the land." Zion will weep and bleed under the frown of her enemies—for how can "her walls be salvation and her gates praise," when her watchmen are no longer upon the towers, to "lift up the voice together," as in the days of our fathers?

And who has inflicted all these great evils upon the church, and is still pushing them on to more disastrous issues? Has she done it with her own hands—have her spiritual guides and teachers done it, or have they agreed together to unsettle her foundations and waste her vital strength?

Our object in the preceding remarks has not been to *criminate*, but to *convince*. If the *system* of breaking up pastoral relations is bad, it is much more important to ex-

pose the evil, than to ascertain by whom it was introduced. Though it might be impossible for an impartial reformer to show, at whose door the blame chiefly lies; whether the churches or the ministers have most to answer for, it is easy to trace the progress of the change, from its stealthy commencement, down to the present hour. Under the old system, when a minister became superannuated, or was disabled by sickness, it would sometimes happen that the people could not well afford to continue his salary; and in other cases they were dissuaded from it by the pleadings of covetousness; but the law was imperative. They could not cast off their pastor for the sin of growing old in their service, or of breaking down his health by over-action, and they began to seek for a remedy. Now and then an instance of real hardship would occur, where the incumbent might have relieved them by giving up his legal claim, without any serious inconvenience to himself. Whenever such a case did happen, it was laid hold of by restless men, to persuade the people, that they were oppressed, and that they ought to throw off the yoke as soon as possible. The most obvious method of relieving themselves was, by changing the system, and altering the terms of settlement. There must be some stipulation in the call, which would enable them to get rid of the pastor, if they chose. Hence that most mischievous device of giving *three, or six months* warning. The churches came into it rather slowly, and the ministers were, we believe, at first universally opposed to it. It was seriously debated in ordaining councils, and in some few instances was successfully resisted. The writer of this article well remembers the first attempt of the kind, which was made in the district where he was then settled. The Consociation, consisting of course of pastors and delegates, refused to proceed, because the six months condition was annexed to the call. "They doubted whereunto it would grow." His voice and his vote, were in that refusal, and he reflects upon it with increasing satisfaction, in view of the more full and blighting developments of the system. Though the pastors were at first strongly opposed to it, they at length yielded the point. And it is not at all strange, if some, in a little while, became advocates of the new system. For they saw, that it was a sword with two edges. It would cut both ways. If the congregation could sever the bond, at any moment, so could they.

If it enabled the people at pleasure to look out for better ministers, it gave the pastors the same liberty also, to look out for better parishes. And so the struggle ended. The warning proviso has become a part of our ecclesiastical law. There is a sort of tacit agreement between the parties that it shall be inserted, and when we come to the ordination, no questions are asked. If the parties are satisfied, so are we. And so we go on, ordaining, installing, and dismissing, as if it was the chief end of our ministry. Which of the parties suffers most by the system, the pastors or the people it is hard to say.

Both are wasting away under it. It may be a slow, but it is a sure consumption, in the ministry and in the churches. We believe, however, that if there is any difference, the churches suffer most. Now and then, without doubt, the conditional contract, enables them to throw off a burden which they could not well sustain, or to better themselves, by the convenient resort to dismissal, and installation.—But when will they learn to make general principles, and not extraordinary and insulated cases, the basis of legislation? In consulting the general good, and even her own permanent advantage, how much better is it for a church, once or twice in a century, to pay a few hundred dollars for the support of an aged pastor of Christ, worn out in her service, or to sit for a little while under an inefficient ministry, than to act upon a policy which, however well it may work for a time, is gradually and surely undermining her foundations. And how much better for one pastor in twenty, to labor in too narrow a field, and to suffer many personal inconveniences, than for the whole ministry to suffer, as it now does, by the extreme instability of its most sacred relations.

Do we then plead for a law of the Medes and Persians, to fix every man in his place forever? Or do we put the connection between a minister and his people, on the same ground as the marriage covenant which cannot be broken? No! Certainly not. This is not our meaning. It has always been admitted, and it must be, that good and sufficient reasons *may* exist, for calling a minister to a higher, or a different sphere of usefulness; or for dismissing him from his charge without any such object. And as our Colleges, and Theological Seminaries, and great benevolent institutions multiply, cases of removal must become more frequent.

For the public good requires, that many of the chairs, as well as the more important secretaryships, should be filled by clergymen of some age and experience. Now and then a case may occur, also, in which it is clearly the duty of a pastor to leave a small congregation, and to take charge of a large one. But there is a great difference between transferring ministers from one sphere to another, for urgent reasons, such as these, and dismissing them every day, for trivial causes, or without any reason at all—from the mere caprice of one or other of the parties.

Formerly, where a respectable society became vacant, the question was, where shall we find a *young* man of piety, and talents competent to fill the vacancy? *Now* the more common remark is, a young man will not do for us. We must have a minister, not of first rate talents only, but of age and experience;—and as such are rarely out of employ, the next thing is to look over the length and breadth of the land for some one who is either about to leave his people, or who, it is thought, may be induced to listen to a call. Now, we think this policy, in most cases, both cruel and unwise. We are no advocates for bringing young men, however promising, into the ministry at a very early age. On the contrary, it is, and has long been our deliberate judgment, that the nearer thirty a man is, when he takes upon him the pastoral office, the better. But it is our strong conviction also, that churches would be great gainers, for the most part, by returning to “the old paths,” and calling *young* men, instead of looking out for settled ministers, to fill their vacancies. There is a freshness and an ardor in a man’s early labors, which we can scarcely expect to find later in life. And then, the young people and children, the rising hope of every congregation, are much more likely to become ardently attached to a young minister than to one who is considerably advanced in life.

We believe it would be found, upon a careful and extended investigation of the subject, that even in large societies, men, who were never settled before, have sustained themselves as well in the long run, as those who, on account of their age and experience, have been taken from other parishes. They may not be able to do as much the first year, nor even the second; but they will be all the while gaining. If a congregation is so large, that a young man of good health and talents cannot safely take charge of it, let it be

divided, or if the house is so large, or so badly constructed, that no ordinary voice can fill it, then let it be pulled down, and a new one be erected in its place.

And now, if we have succeeded in showing, that the new system of frequent removals and translations, is highly injurious both to ministers and churches, it becomes a very serious question, whether any thing can be done to arrest this growing evil; and whether it is too late to return to the "old paths" and the good way? Certainly it is not too late unless the parties choose to make it so.

The first thing is, for both minister and people to be convinced, that the system upon which we are acting, is bad; is weakening the churches, and lowering the respectability, and diminishing the usefulness of the clergy. It must be felt to be a great evil, before any effectual remedy is likely to be applied. This done, and the rest is extremely easy. The congregations have only to say, we must return to the old paths. We must have a permanent ministry. We have tried the *warning* experiment long enough. It is working our ruin. We want to have you *settle* with us, and not merely *stop*,—that we may have time to know you, and not be afraid to love you. Your acceptance of our call we shall consider as a pledge that you mean to stay, and that you will not leave us, but for the gravest and most weighty reasons. If you wish merely for a resting-place, we cannot accommodate you, for we must have a permanent minister. And let ministers ask, *when* invited to settle, do you wish me to *stay*? I want a *home*. I want, whenever I am ordained, to feel that I am settled, and that the people will not send me away for any slight cause. I cannot consent to be placed in a condition of more precariousness than that of a hireling, upon six months sufferance. If you have different views let me know it, "that I may turn to the right hand or the left." Let ministers and churches just frankly act on grounds like these, and it would put a new aspect, at once, upon our pastoral relations.

Brethren in the ministry and in the churches, have *we* any thing to do in this matter—any influence to exert—any advice to give? If the system which we have been looking at is chargeable with such evils as have been specified, then we are answerable for their continuance, just so far as our influence might avail, to remove them.

Let the subject be thoroughly examined in all its bearings and tendencies, and then let every minister and every Christian act, in the fear of God, with fervent supplications for the teaching of his Spirit; with earnest desires to find "the good way;" and with "full purpose of heart to walk therein."

ART. III. REMARKS ON BISHOP SMITH'S ARTICLE ON THE TERMS OF COMMUNION.

By REV. ENOCH POND, D D., Prof. of Theology, Bangor, Me.

This article, the first in the last number of the Literary and Theological Review, is entitled, "Effects upon the Church, of its relative position at different periods." It is not my intention to remark on all the positions of Bishop Smith in this article, but simply on those in which he censures the practice of the Puritans, and of most of the evangelical denominations in this country, relative to the terms of Communion in their churches.

"The first Christians," he says, "acted upon the principle, that the sacraments and outward ordinances of the Church were designed to distinguish a nation of Christians from heathen nations. Protestants, or at least, Puritans amongst Protestants, are attempting to act upon the principle, that true Christians are to be distinguished from nominal, by the reception of the sacraments.

"To suppose that the Great Head of the Church ever designed thus to distinguish real Christians from the pretended, is to dream that the power of discerning spirits has been bestowed forever upon his ministers, and to go in the face of the plainest passages of Scripture. Whereas, to adopt the scriptural and primitive idea, that baptism is the badge of a people outwardly dedicated to God, both young and old, bond and free, male and female, as the Jews were dedicated, in their national capacity, to the Lord, is to embrace a principle at once intelligible and practical. Then no fiery ordeal to repel unworthy recipients from the Lord's table, unauthorized in its character, unequal in its operation, and useless, if not pernicious in its effects, will be deemed indispensable. The simple rule will be, (as after all it must be,)—'by their fruits ye shall know them.' The thought would no longer be entertained for a moment, that coming to the Lord's table is the mark by which the true Christian is to be distinguished from the merely baptized person. But nominal Christians, whether only baptized or communicants, would then be watched for the fruits following their profession, to show whether or not they were real believers."

Speaking of "the horror with which his education inspired him, and which he still entertains, of seeing the

depraved and the unworthy admitted to the Lord's table, and adults taking upon them the baptismal vow, without reflection and deep sincerity," and of the "methods of preventing these enormities," Bishop Smith adds,

"It is, says the modern puritan, by adopting the principle that, by a close personal examination into the signs of conversion, none but the changed at heart, shall be received to a participation in the sacraments. It is, says the Christian of the old school, and of the days of Cyprian, by receiving ALL upon their serious profession, THEM and THEIR CHILDREN, and then to keep the Church as pure as possible by strict discipline.

"If the Apostles understood their Master, his divine methods for keeping the Church as pure as it well can be on earth, were embodied in the discipline of the Church, if not in the time of Cyprian, yet surely in that of Irenæus, and Polycarp, and Ignatius. But no, says the Simon Pure of modern times, we have hit upon a principle which is wiser and more potent than that of the first Christians—we will make strict inquest into the evidences of personal religion, we will APPOINT A COMMITTEE to distinguish infallibly between THE TRUE CHRISTIAN and the FALSE PROFESSOR!

"As circumcision was for all born of Israel, or brought into any of his families, and the passover for all the circumcised; so is baptism for all who belong to the community of Christians, (unless grown to man's estate without it, when the profession of repentance and faith, as at the first, must be required,) and the Lord's Supper for all the baptized, except those whose worldly or irreligious lives, *whose overt acts*, have subjected them to holy discipline."

The doctrine of Bishop Smith, as exhibited in the foregoing extracts, seems to be this; that "the sacraments of the church were designed to distinguish *a nation of Christians from heathen nations*," and not *those professing to be true Christians of every nation, from those who make no such profession*. Accordingly, instead of having those only who exhibit satisfactory evidence of piety, received to communion, he would have all belonging to a Christian community baptized, and all the baptized admitted to the Lord's Supper, with the exception of "those whose worldly or irreligious lives have subjected them to holy discipline."

I hope I have not misunderstood Bishop Smith. I certainly have endeavoured to represent him correctly; and have given the above extracts at length, that the reader may have the means of forming a judgment as to the real sentiments of the author.

In support of his particular views, relative to Christian communion, and in opposition to those which prevail in most of the evangelical denominations of our country,

Bishop Smith urges various arguments, which it is my purpose now briefly to consider.

He does not place any reliance on the practice of the Apostles and their fellow-labourers, as exhibited in the New Testament; for this, he acknowledges, is against him. "At the first institution of Christianity, the extreme of the modern notion was of necessity acted upon, and none were received to any of the ordinances of the gospel, but upon a profession of personal faith and piety," p. 162. After reading the other parts of Bishop Smith's article, we were not quite prepared for an admission such as this. It should require very strong reasons to enforce any practice on the church, acknowledged to be at variance with that of the Apostles.

But "the extreme of the modern notion was then acted upon *of necessity*." The only candidates for divine ordinances were adults, upon their own profession; and we are not to infer from the practice of the Apostles in receiving these, in what manner they would receive those who had been baptized in infancy, on the profession of their parents. It is rightly conceded by Bishop Smith, that the Apostles received no unbaptized adults to communion, but upon a profession of personal faith and piety. For them, such a profession was indispensable. And if we are to suppose, that in the case of baptized children, they would substitute any other condition in place of a profession of faith and piety, they must have done it, obviously, on one of two grounds: they must have believed, either that baptism entitled the children of professing Christians to communion *without piety*; or that the spirit of piety *was infused in baptism*, so that they might fairly presume that every baptized child was pious, unless they had positive evidence to the contrary. But can either of these opinions be fairly ascribed to the Apostles? Did they believe that, in the case of children, mere baptism, without piety, was a sufficient qualification for Christian communion? This, I presume, will not be pretended. Sure I am that it cannot be, with any appearance of reason. For if baptism alone was sufficient in the case of children, why not also in that of adults? Why should baptism, and a profession of piety, be made indispensable in the case of adults, and mere baptism, without piety, be deemed sufficient in the case of children? Who believes that the Apostles instituted these two so widely different conditions of communion

at the Lord's table ;—that they not only opened the door, but took measures, to draw into their churches the unregenerate with the pious, the unbelieving and unholy with the saints?

But it will be said, perhaps, that the Apostles regarded baptism and regeneration as the same thing ;—that they believed divine grace to be implanted, the spirit of piety to be infused in baptism, so that they esteemed all baptized children to be truly pious, and qualified as such for communion at the Lord's table.—This sentiment, I am aware, is held by some Episcopalians, and is supposed to be inculcated in the standards of their church ; but I have no evidence that the Apostles embraced any such sentiment, or that it has the least foundation in reason, or in truth. For what is there in the baptism of water, administered ever so canonically, which has the least tendency to regenerate the heart, and infuse piety into the soul ? Baptism with water is an *external, material, corporeal* application ; whereas the implanting of divine grace in the soul is an *internal, spiritual* operation ; and what possible adaptation or tendency has the former to secure the latter ?

If it be said that we have *promises*, that the implantation of grace shall accompany the right administration of baptism, I have only to insist that such promises be pointed out. I know of no promises of this nature, and until they are produced, shall take it upon me to say, that none exist.—Besides ; if the implantation of Divine grace accompanies baptism in the case of children, why not also in the case of adults ? And why must *they* profess faith and piety previous to baptism, when baptism itself, if rightly administered, has the promise, and is sure to bring with it the implantation of faith, and piety in their souls ?

I have many objections to this strange notion of baptismal regeneration, besides those hinted at above. Baptism is the *sign* of regeneration—not regeneration itself ; and to suppose it to be regeneration, is to confound the sign with the thing signified. It is, moreover, to attribute a mystical efficacy to an external rite, at the bare mention of which reason revolts, and of which the scriptures know absolutely nothing.

The Apostles well understood that baptism, whether administered to an adult or an infant, did not secure the sanctification of the soul ; for they did not regard some whom they had themselves baptised, as sanctified persons.

Take the instance of Simon the sorcerer. He had been baptized by an Evangelist, if not by an Apostle; and yet he was shortly afterwards told, that he was "in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity." Thousands have been baptized who have not been regenerated; and thousands more, in all probability, have been regenerated, and have gone to heaven, who have not been baptized; and in view of facts such as these, who can pretend that a spiritual regeneration always accompanies baptism? Who will charge such absurdity upon the Apostles of Jesus?

It is conceded by Bishop Smith that, in the case of adults, none were admitted by the Apostles to the communion of the church, but "upon a profession of personal faith and piety;" and it now appears that, in respect to baptized children, they must have had the same rule. For after demanding "a profession of faith and piety" in adults, as a condition of communion, they certainly would not have accepted of baptism, without piety, in the case of children. Nor is there the least reason for supposing that they held spiritual regeneration and baptism to be the same thing, or that the former is always accompanied by the latter.

But although the views of Bishop Smith receive no countenance from the Apostles, he appeals with great confidence to the Christians of the old school, and of the days of Cyprian." But to this appeal to Cyprian, with a view, either to establish a practice in the church different from that of the Apostles, or to ascertain how, under other circumstances, the Apostles would themselves have practised, I feel constrained to object; and for the very sufficient reason that, in respect to both doctrine and practice, the Church, in the days of Cyprian, had departed very essentially from the simplicity of the gospel. And this departure commenced, and had made the most alarming progress, with reference to the *externals* of religion—the government and sacraments of the church.* A mysterious

* And here, by the way, we have an objection to the particular plan of union, suggested by Bishop Smith, in a previous volume of the Literary and Theological Review. (See vol. 2, p. 515.) He would have us "select some period of Christian antiquity—the year 300, for example"—and ascertain what was then the "external form of Christianity;" and all come together upon the same form. But may we not as easily determine the "external form of Christianity" in the days of the Apostles, as in the year 300? And then, again, it is certain that, long before the year referred to, the "external form of Christianity" had been considerably altered, and, as we think, defaced.

efficacy was attributed to the sacraments, and they were obscured and burthened with superstitious rites. "None were admitted to the sacred font, until the exorcist had, by a solemn and menacing formula, declared them free from servitude to the prince of darkness." Baptism was considered as connected, not only with regeneration, but with the free and full pardon of sin, and a triumph over all spiritual enemies. Accordingly, the neophyte, or recently baptized person, as a new-born babe, was fed with milk and honey; and was adorned with a white robe and crown, in token of his purity, and of his conquest over the world. Sponsors, at this period, had been introduced in connexion with baptism, and the sign of the cross, and the anointing with holy oil. And so potent was baptism conceived to be, to cleanse the soul from sin, and so difficult was it supposed to be to obtain the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism, that persons were sometimes exhorted, and that too by grave teachers in the Church, to defer baptism till near the close of life, or at least till the temptations of life were in great measure escaped. The Lord's Supper was, at this time, celebrated in close and awful seclusion, after the manner of the heathen mysteries; and from a mistaken apprehension of our Saviour's words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," the partaking of the supper was held to be essential to salvation. Under this impression, young children, so early as the days of Cyprian, began to be brought to the Lord's Table, and fed with the consecrated memorials of Christ's body and blood.*

That innovations such as those here related—strange, unwarranted, and some of them of heathen original—had crept in and corrupted the sacraments of the church, as early as

* In his book *de Lapsis*, Cyprian relates a story of an infant child which, in the absence of its parents, had been carried to an idol temple, and there fed from the sacrifice. Shortly after, its mother brought it to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; but the child "could not with any quietness hear the prayers, but sometimes fell into weeping, and sometimes into convulsions." And when the Deacon went to give the child the cup, "as by a divine instinct, it turned away its face, and shut its mouth." And when the Deacon forced the cup into the child's mouth, "then followed retchings and vomitings. The Eucharist could not stay in its polluted mouth and body." This, I believe, is the first mention, in Christian antiquity, of infant communion. I refer to the case, in justification of the assertion above made, that so early as the days of Cyprian, young children were sometimes brought to the Lord's table.

the days of Cyprian, is matter of unquestioned history. And in view of them, it may well be asked, shall an appeal be sustained from the apostles to Cyprian, on an important point of Christian practice? Or shall we consent to be governed by the authority of Cyprian, in questions relative to the sacraments of the church? Will Bishop Smith himself accept of such a guide? He may be willing to adopt some things from Cyprian, as for instance the sponsors in baptism, and the sign of the cross. But will he consent to receive exorcism, and the holy unction, and the milk and honey, and the white robe and crown, and the secret celebration of the holy supper, and the administering of it to infant children? The authority, if admitted, proves vastly too much even for those who adduce it; and consequently it must be rejected.

On many accounts, we honour the fathers, and scarcely one of them more than the venerable Cyprian. We honour him as a witness to important facts relating to the history of the church. We honour him for his faithful labours and patient sufferings in the cause of Christ, and for his unshaken constancy in persecutions and in death. But in respect to the doctrines, government, and sacraments of the church, we rejoice that we have "a more sure word of prophecy"—a safer and better guide than the authority of Cyprian.

In confirmation of his theory relative to the admission of baptized persons to communion, Bishop Smith appeals to the Jewish church. "As circumcision was for all born of Israel, or brought into any of his families, and the passover for all the circumcised, so is baptism for all the community of Christians, and the Lord's supper for all the baptized," &c. p. 164.

In regard to the practice of the Jewish church, two questions properly arise: First, were infant children required to partake of the passover? And secondly, if they were not—if before partaking, they must arrive to years of understanding—were they not required, when they did partake, to do something which amounted to a virtual profession of religion? In answer to these inquiries, I remark, that there is no evidence that children, in mere infancy, were required or permitted to partake of the Jewish passover. And if it shall be insisted that they were partakers, the argument from this circumstance, if it proves any thing, will prove too much. It will require those, who

deem it an authority, to establish the practice of infant communion.

But we have good reason for saying, that the young Israelite must pass the season of infancy, and arrive to years of understanding, before coming to the passover of the Lord. As much as this is indicated in the original institution of the passover. "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, *What mean ye by this service?* that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover;" (Ex. 12: 26.) implying that children were not expected to come to the passover, till they were of age to inquire into its meaning. Accordingly it is said that when our Saviour was *twelve years old*, he "went up to Jerusalem," at the passover, "*after the custom of the feast.*" (Luke 2: 42.)

The most respectable commentators, and other writers on Jewish customs, decide, that children first came to the passover at about the age of twelve years, when they were considered as making a profession of religion, and becoming members of the Jewish church.

HYRCANUS in JOSEPHUS. "The law forbids the son to eat of the sacrifice, before he has come to the temple, and there *presented an offering to God.*"*

CALVIN. "The passover, which has been succeeded by the sacred supper, did not admit guests of all descriptions promiscuously, but was rightly eaten only by those *who were of sufficient age to be able to inquire into its meaning.*"†

BISHOP PATRICK. "When children were *twelve years old*, their parents were bound to bring them to the temple at the passover, where seeing what was done, they would be led to inquire, *What mean ye by these things?*"‡

POOLE. "Children, at the age of *twelve years*, were brought by their parents to the temple; and from that time, they began *to eat of the passover and other sacrifices.*"§

GUISE. "At this age" (twelve years) "the Jewish doctors say that persons were obliged to do the duties of adult-church-membership."¶

BROWN. "It is nowhere said at what particular age the Jewish children were admitted to the passover. The general rule on the subject was, when they could ascend

* Antiq. Lib. xii. Cap. iv. § 8.

† Com. on Ex. xii. 26.

‡ Paraphrase Luke ii. 42.

† Instit. Lib. iv. Cap. xvi. § 30.

§ Synopsis Ex. xii. 26.

Moriah, with a hold of their father's hand. Our Saviour attended when he was twelve years of age, or when he uncovered his head, and obtained the degree of 'son of the commandment;' and perhaps this was as soon as was generally convenient."*

ROSENMULLER. "The Jews were accustomed to bring their sons, who had attained to their *twelfth year*, to the festivals at Jerusalem."†

KUINOEL. "It was a custom of the Jews in the time of Christ, that youths who had attained to the age of *twelve years*, should be brought to the festivals at Jerusalem."‡

BLOOMFIELD. "The custom was, not to take them" (the Jewish children) "to the passover, until they should have attained the years of puberty, a period which the Rabbins tell us was fixed at the *twelfth year*, when they were held amenable to the law, and were called sons of precept. Then were they also INTRODUCED INTO THE CHURCH, initiated into its doctrines and ceremonies, and consequently were taken with their relations to Jerusalem at the festivals."§

STACKHOUSE. "It is commonly observed, by those that are learned in the customs and institutions of the Jews, that, till a child was *twelve years old*, he was not obliged to go to Jerusalem at the time of the passover." Stackhouse supposes that, when our Saviour went up to the passover, with his parents, at the age of twelve years, he was *examined* by the Jewish doctors, as their custom was in the case of children; and that this accounts for it that "he was found in one of the rooms adjoining the temple, where the doctors of the law used to meet, not only hearing them, but asking them questions."*

DR. GILL. "According to the maxims of the Jews, persons were not obliged to the duties of the law, or subject to the penalties of it in case of non-performance, until they were, a female, at the age of twelve years and one day, and a male, at the age of thirteen years and one day." "They were not reckoned ADULT CHURCH MEMBERS TILL THEN; nor then either, unless *worthy persons*; for so it is said, '*He that is worthy is called, at thirteen years of age, a son of the congregation of Israel,*' that is a MEMBER OF THE CHURCH."†

* Heb. Antiq. Sect. iii.

† Com. on Luke ii. 42.

• Hist. of N. Test. Chap. i.

† Com. on Luke ii. 42.

‡ Critical Digest on Luke ii. 42.

§ Com. on Luke ii. 42.

Although the visible church was essentially the same body before the coming of Christ, that it is now, still, in passing from one dispensation to the other, its external form was in a measure changed in accomodation to the altered state of things. Its bloody, sacrificial, typical rites were of course laid aside. It lost also its national, political character, and became a more purely spiritual body. The conditions of membership, however, have been, in all periods essentially the same. No person could join himself to the church of Israel, or continue in the church, without *professing* to be a holy, sanctified person. When the Israelites renewed covenant in the wilderness, they avouched the Lord Jehovah to be *their God*, to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes and his commandments; and the Lord avouched them to be *his people*, as he had promised them. (Deut. 27: 16—18.) The rites and ceremonies which the Israelites were required to observe, all carried with them a profession of holiness. To borrow the language of another, “when they presented their peace offerings and thank offerings, they practically professed true gratitude to God. When they presented their sin offerings and trespass offerings, they practically professed real repentance and godly sorrow for sin. And when the high priest confessed over the scape goat the sins of the whole people, and then slew the other goat in sacrifice, this was a practical profession, not only of repentance, but of faith in the blood of Christ. The passover was in like manner a type of the Divine Saviour, and could not be acceptably celebrated without faith in the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. In short, all the sacrifices appointed under the law were of such a nature, that none could offer them sincerely without professing and exercising true holiness. This is clear evidence, that all who became members of the church of Israel, entered into it under the profession and appearance of true piety.”*—Accordingly, whenever this people manifested that their *hearts were not right in the sight of God*, they were charged with *hypocrisy*, and *breach of covenant*, and were required to *repent*, and turn unto the Lord *with all their heart*. (Compare Ps. 78: 37 with Joel 2: 12.) And when they were finally cut off from being the visible people of God, the terrible act of excision came upon them, be-

* See Dr. Emmons' Dissertation on Terms of Communion, p. 34

cause of their *unbelief*. (See Rom. 11 : 20. I make these remarks in justice to the ancient but oft depreciated and injured church of God ; and with a view to show, that in coming to be a member of this church in full communion—in coming to offer his sacrifice and partake of the pass-over, the youthful Israelite made a virtual profession of faith and holiness, and assumed obligations which he could not fulfil, unless his heart were right in the sight of God.

Bishop Smith insists, that the practice which he condemns "is exclusively English and Anglo-American," and that where it prevails, it is of comparatively recent date. "It is no where to be found, amongst continental Protestants, and only to a small extent among American Protestants of continental origin. Amongst German Lutherans, and the Dutch Reformed, not a child can be found unbaptized, not a youth without confirmation, not a grown person (unless boldly ungodly) not a communicant. And even amongst the descendants of Plymouth Puritans, within the memory of some now living, whole country towns were to be found where there were not ten dissenters from the Congregational church, and hardly as many unbaptized, or who did not, at a certain period of life, become communicants, if not notoriously wicked in their conduct." p. 163.

I pretend not to be particularly acquainted with the forms of admission to full communion among the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Europe, or among "the German Lutheran and Dutch Reformed"* of our own country.—Still, I shall be surprised to learn that these churches do not require of all who become members in full communion, what amounts to a profession of faith and piety. Let it here be distinctly understood, that the profession which the church *requires* is one thing ; the manner in which this profession is *often made* is quite another. I repeat, I shall be surprised to learn that in the standards of the very respectable bodies of Christians above referred to, there is not required, of those who join with them in communion, a *good profession*—a profession which cannot be sincerely and truly made, without heart-felt piety. How many among them make this profession *hypocritically*, and *visibly* feed upon the body and blood of the Saviour, while *in*

* Dr. De Witt, of the Dutch Reformed Church, has informed the Christian public, that Bishop Smith's information respecting the practice of that denomination was utterly incorrect, and his statement the very reverse of the truth.

heart they deny him, I shall not take it upon me to say.* Certain it is that, in the church of which Bishop Smith is a dignitary, no person can be confirmed, and become a member in full communion, without the *profession* of true piety. Of this any one must be satisfied, who will attentively read the baptismal service, and compare it with "the order of confirmation." The person who presents himself for confirmation publicly and solemnly promises to "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, so that he will not follow nor be led by them." He promises "obediently to keep God's holy will and commandments, and to walk in the same all the days of his life." And is not this a profession of piety? Can any sincerely make this profession and enter into this covenant, and not be a real Christian? The only question then is, whether persons shall be encouraged or permitted to make this profession hypocritically. To make it sincerely and properly, persons must be truly pious. Shall then the bishops see to it, on a faithful examination, that those whom they confirm are truly pious? Or shall they lay hands on all who present themselves, whose lives are not scandalously immoral, and incur the hazard of permitting and encouraging members to take God's holy covenant upon their lips, while his love is not in their hearts?

As to the "Plymouth Puritans," and those who descend from them, *their* story is more familiar to us. The church covenants of the first settlers of New England all required the profession of true piety; and their ministers required the same. For more than a century after the settlement commenced, it would have been hard to find an instance of a person admitted to full communion in any of the churches, without a previous relation of Christian experience, and a public, solemn profession of faith in the Saviour. The existence of the *half-way covenants*, as they were called (however objectionable on other grounds) is a standing

* Hahn, an evangelical Lutheran Theologian of high standing, has the following remark on the subject of confirmation. "More care than is usually shown should be taken, that no one should receive this seal of grace who does not give sure signs of his fitness and worthiness."—Manual, p. 558.

Speaking of confirmation as a *personal profession of faith*, Schleiermacher says in his Theology, that "the greatest attention ought to be given to it, in order that it may constitute, so far as it lies in the power of the church to render it so, a true and worthy completion of infant baptism." Vol. ii. p. 462.

proof of the strictness of our fathers in admitting persons to full communion in the church.

In the early part of the last century, it began to be insisted on in New England, that the Lord's Supper is among the appointed means of regeneration ; that it is the duty of the unregenerate, regarding themselves as such, to come to this ordinance ; and consequently that a profession of piety should not be required, as a condition of communion in the church. This doctrine was strenuously opposed at first as being contrary to the principles and practice of almost all the churches ; and yet, so congenial was it to the state of the times, and to the feelings of many hearts, that it spread with rapidity, and to a great extent prevailed in the country. The covenants of the churches were not immediately altered, but persons were encouraged to enter into them inconsiderately. They were encouraged to *say* that before God, which they did not feel, and which, in private, they did not profess to feel. They were encouraged to "avouch the Lord Jehovah to be their God, and to give up themselves to him to be his servants," while inwardly they regarded themselves as the servants, not of God, but of sin. In consequence of this strange and unwarrantable innovation, the number of communicants in many places increased, and there followed, ere long, those halcyon days spoken of by Bishop Smith, when in some "country towns there were not ten dissenters from the Congregational church, and hardly as many unbaptized."

The consequences of these measures, and of this mode of increase, were such as might have been anticipated. The churches being replenished with unconverted members, the pulpits were soon occupied, to considerable extent at least, with unconverted ministers, who preached, first, a dry and dead orthodoxy, and next a cold and sneering Arminianism ;—and long before the close of the century, the tares of Unitarianism were plentifully sown, and were beginning to give promise of an exuberant harvest.*

It was well said by the great Dr. Owen, that "the letting go of this principle, that *particular churches ought to*

* So early as the year 1788, an American Unitarian writes thus to England ; "I cannot express to you the avidity with which these Unitarian publications are sought after. Our friends here are clearly convinced that the Unitarian doctrine will soon become the prevailing opinion in this country."—It may be added here, that the first church in New England which became Unitarian, was an Episcopal church ; and that the first two clergymen who came out on the same side, were Episcopalians.

consist of regenerate persons, brought in the great apostacy of the Christian church." There can be no doubt, that "the letting go" of this radical principle in New England, was one great cause of the lamented Unitarian apostacy, into which so many of the Pilgrim churches have fallen.

Bishop Smith seems to suppose that there are no distinguishing marks of true piety; for he ridicules the idea of so much as attempting to distinguish between true Christians and those who are not. "To suppose," he says, "that the Great Head of the church ever designed thus to distinguish real Christians from the pretended, is to dream that the power of discerning spirits has been bestowed forever upon his ministers, and to go in the face of the plainest passages of Scripture," p. 161. Again; "In the course of ages," "men arose who, dreaming that they had made discovery of a new principle, capable of entirely purifying a corrupt church, endeavoured to establish the practice of distinguishing the true from the merely nominal Christians by receiving none to the Lord's Supper who were not, by the application of their tests, undoubtedly converted and changed men." p. 162. And again, "says the Simon Pure of modern times, we have hit upon a principle, which is wiser and more potent than that of the first Christians; we will make strict inquest into the evidences of personal religion; we will APPOINT A COMMITTEE, to distinguish infallibly between the TRUE CHRISTIAN AND THE FALSE PROFESSOR."* p. 163.

I will not consume time in remarking on the language here employed. When the author has reflected more upon it, he will doubtless wish, that at least he had *expressed* his ideas in other terms.

But is it true that men cannot, without a miraculous discerning of spirits, distinguish ordinarily the *marks*, the *evidences* of true piety, from those of worldliness and sin? Is piety in the heart altogether a hidden treasure—a light under a bushel? Or is it a living, operative principle—a light that can and will be seen?

Bishop Smith professes to adhere to the rule of the Saviour,—“by their *fruits* ye shall know them;” but intimates that no fruits are to be suspected, except such “worldly and irreligious lives” as may properly subject the au-

* The capitals here employed are those of the Author.

thors of them to "holy discipline." But are there no more peculiar, more distinguishing "fruits" of piety than those here referred to—"fruits" which may be as well exhibited by what Bishop Smith calls the "unbaptized heathen," as by the great body of professing Christians? Is a freedom from scandalous worldliness and irreligion all that may with propriety be looked for in persons possessing true religion? What is true religion? If it were no more than to love those who love us, and be kind to those who are kind to us, and to lend hoping to receive as much again—no more than a mere worldly honesty, or a honied selfishness; then honesty and morality in the sight of men might constitute its appropriate fruit. But what, I ask again, is true religion? What is it represented to be in the Scriptures? It is to love God; and to love the people of God; and love the Saviour; and love the Bible; and love the duties of religion; and love the souls of men. It is to mourn over our sins committed against God; to seek and obtain forgiveness through the merits of his Son: and to rejoice in him with a joy unspeakable and full of glory. And now will not such a flame of divine love and joy, glowing in the breast, manifest itself in something more than a mere decent morality—such morality as might be exhibited by a heathen, or an infidel? Those who are truly religious, in the sense explained, will be disposed, of course, to speak of God; and to pray to God; and to read and ponder the rich word of God; and to choose the society of Christians; and avoid the society of those whose hearts are manifestly set on other things. They will not forsake the assembling of themselves together, either in the social meeting or in the house of God. They will show that they love the souls of men, by untiring, persevering labours for their good. And if asked the reason of the hope that is in them, they will be prepared to give it with meekness and fear. They will not be disposed to repel, as impertinent, all inquiries concerning their spiritual state, but will be ready to speak, on suitable occasions, of what they hope God has done for their souls.

The marks of true piety do not seem to me to be so very dubious, or so difficult to be discovered, as some have supposed. As I have said already, true piety in the soul is a living operative principle. It will be felt, and it will be manifested; and the manifestations of it will be as visible

and distinctive, as those of any other predominant trait or disposition of mind. The inordinate lover of wealth usually manifests, with sufficient clearness, what is the state and temper of his heart. Among those acquainted with him, there need be no mistake on the subject, and commonly there is none. The same may be said of the aspirants to worldly fame and honor; and of those who are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God. And why may not the same be said of these who are lovers of God, more than of pleasure, or of the world? What reason can be assigned—when other prominent traits of character can be so easily and accurately traced—why piety should be regarded as a hidden treasure, and those ridiculed, as being “the Simon Pures” of the age, and as laying claim to an infallible “discerning of spirits,” who pretend to judge of the evidences of piety, and to form an opinion as to the religious characters of men around them?

It is peculiarly unfortunate for Bishop Smith—as he has taken it upon him to censure other denominations on account of their examinations for church communion—that he is officially called and bound to do continually the same thing. In every instance of confirmation, he virtually demands of the candidate, “Dost thou here, in the presence of God and of this congregation, renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow or be led by them? Wilt thou obediently keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?” In other words, “Do you trust in God that you are truly pious, and prepared to come in faith to the supper of the Lord?” And in case of ordination, the priest who presents the candidates, is required to certify to the bishop, that he has “inquired concerning them, and also examined them,” in respect not only to their learning, but their “godly conversation.” And then it is enjoined upon the bishop to “*examine* every one of those who are to be ordained,” “in the presence of the people,” not only as to their intentions, and their faith, but relative to their *internal, spiritual character*.*—Now we do not complain of these examinations. We heartily approve of them; and only wish we had more evidence that they were always conducted in the spirit of

*See the several Ordination Services, in the Book of Common Prayer.

the book which enjoins them. But we do think that it ill becomes a bishop, who is in the constant practice of examining candidates for confirmation and ordination, as to their inward fitness for the obligations which they are about to assume, to censure and reproach other denominations of Christians, because they think proper to examine those who offer themselves as candidates for communion in their churches. If such examinations are proper in the Episcopal church, why not in other churches? And if a bishop may take it upon him to examine, why may not a humble pastor, in a meeting of elders or of brethren, do the same?

But I will not dwell longer on this point, though I deem it one of very great importance. There are marks laid down in the Scriptures by which examinations may be conducted, and there manifestly should be a careful examination of all those who propose to connect themselves with the visible Church of Christ. "The power of the keys," as it has been called, is vested *somewhere*;—I will not now undertake to say where—but certainly *somewhere*. And those who hold the keys of the visible kingdom of Christ, are not to throw open the doors of this kingdom to all, indiscriminately, who may think proper to claim admittance. It is incumbent on them to see who these claimants are, and what are their qualifications for communion with the saints. Are they children of the kingdom? Or are they strangers and foreigners? Are they of Christ's sheep? Or are they wolves who have put on the clothing of sheep, only that they may the better deceive and destroy? If these questions do not admit of an answer, then let the keys of Christ's kingdom be cast away, and the doors be thrown open, and the distinction between church and world abolished. But if they do admit of an answer—as most certainly they do—then let those on whom it devolves to guard the doors of the church, look well to the character and qualifications of those whom they admit within the sacred enclosure.

Bishop Smith endeavours to sustain his views of the conditions of church membership, by exhibiting the strange state of things which has resulted from the opposite practice. "Our country," he says, "is nominally Christian, and yet is not Christian. Baptized Christians are distinguished from a great mass of unbaptized heathen,

who yet, in a certain sense, are not heathen. And communicants are distinguished from the world and from the baptized, as though they alone were Christians, whilst (so lost is all discipline) by their lives and conduct, they are distinguishable neither from the world of the baptized, or of the unbaptized." (p. 162.) "In point of fact," says he again, "we have amongst us three classes of persons,—the baptized who, if communicants, are by all considered the church,—the baptized who do not commune, and yet are ranked with the world,—and the unbaptized who, though heathen in fact, are sometimes more nearly christian in temper than either of the other classes." (p. 164.)

The seeming strangeness of this state of things results, in no small degree, from the strangeness of the terms, in which the author has seen fit to describe it. All the unbaptized among us, (some of whom, he insists, "are more Christian in temper" than any of our church-members,) are "in fact heathen." They constitute a "great mass of unbaptized heathen." But on what authority does Bishop Smith represent all those in this Christian land, who have not received the ordinance of baptism, as heathen? This, certainly, is not in accordance with the usual signification of the term heathen. "The heathen," says the new Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, "are *pagans*, those who *worship false gods*, and are not acquainted either with the doctrines of the Old Testament or the Christian dispensation." This definition agrees with those of the most distinguished lexicographers, and (what is more) with the general sentiment of mankind. Not even the Jews or Mahometans can with propriety be called heathens; much less the free and enlightened citizens of this Christian land. Does Bishop Smith think, when striving to promote religion in his diocese, that he is labouring for the conversion of the heathen?—But I will not dwell on so plain a case. It is easy for an ingenious man to give an air of singularity to almost any subject, by dressing it up in a singular and unauthorized phraseology.

Bishop Smith represents all baptized children as church members, and thinks it strange that they are not treated as church members—that they are regarded, in any sense, as of the world.—But I have yet to learn, that baptized children are not regarded and treated as properly in our churches, as in the Episcopal church. In both, they are considered

as sustaining a peculiar and solemn relation to the church ; but in neither, as being members of the church in full communion, until by a solemn public act, they take upon themselves the obligations of Christians, and make a public profession of their faith.—The differences among evangelical Pedobaptists in regard to this matter, are probably rather verbal than real. All hold that the covenant of the church extends to its children—that it proffers blessings to its children—and that it brings them into a peculiar relation to the church. Some denominate this relation *membership*; while others prefer to express it without employing so strong and significant a term.

In this view, I see nothing in the relative position of our churches, so singular or portentous as Bishop Smith represents. The churches consist of professed believers in Christ, who have associated together in solemn covenant for the purpose of upholding the doctrines, and maintaining the ordinances of the gospel. Connected with the churches by solemn ties, though not as yet members in full communion, are the company of baptized children. Without the pale of the church are many, alas too many, who do not make a public profession of their faith. These are neither better Christians than our church members on the one hand, nor are they heathens on the other. They are of various grades of character, from those of high promise and respectability, down to the degraded, the vicious, the abandoned. They constitute the body over which the church at home is to exert an influence, to lead them, if possible, to the knowledge, and the acknowledgement of the truth. The church is ready to receive them, as soon as they desire admission, and give evidence of possessing the requisite spiritual qualifications. And we see not how it would benefit this class of men, or render the state of society among us any more desirable or hopeful, if they could be induced to make an hypocritical profession of faith in Christ, and come visibly to the communion of the church, while they had no real spiritual communion, either with the body itself, or with its Head.

Having now examined the views of Bishop Smith, and the arguments by which he attempts to enforce them, perhaps at sufficient length, I proceed to offer reasons for the practice which he condemns; viz., that of receiving none to the communion of the church, whether baptized or unbaptized,

who do not, on a careful examination, exhibit satisfactory evidence of possessing faith in Christ, and a preparation of heart to enjoy communion with his people.

This, as we have seen already, and as Bishop Smith concedes, was the practice of the Apostles and their fellow-labourers. It was those "who were pricked in the heart," and repented, and "gladly received the word," who were admitted to the church on the day of Pentecost. It was not till the Samaritans "*believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of Christ," that they were received by him to baptism and the church. The Holy Ghost fell on the family of Cornelius, and satisfied Peter as to their piety, before he would admit them to the church, and administer to them the ordinances of the gospel. Ananias objected to baptizing Saul of Tarsus, till a voice from heaven assured him of the piety of this recent persecutor. "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel."*

The same too, as we have seen, was the practice of the Jewish church. No person could become a member of that church, or continue a member of it, and attend upon its instituted rites, without *professing* to be a holy, sanctified person—a member of the invisible church and kingdom of the Most High.

We have also seen that the practice of the American Episcopal church is substantially that which we approve, and which Bishop Smith condemns. Every candidate for confirmation, must appear personally before his bishop, and *be examined*, and must answer questions, and give assurances which amount to an open profession of faith and piety. This profession, to be sure, may not be as full, or the examination as particular, as we could desire; still, they go to the length of establishing a principle, and the entire principle for which we contend.

That none should be admitted to communion at the Lord's table without a profession of faith and holiness, is evident, since the Church of Christ on earth is called a *visible* church. A visible church is that which is *visibly*, or which *appears* to be a branch of the *real* church—of the real invisible kingdom of Christ. And consequently

* I should have quoted, in this connexion, Acts viii. 37, "*If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest,*" were there not some reason to regard this entire verse as an interpolation.

a member of the visible church should be one who is *visibly*, or who *appears* to be, a real disciple and follower of the Saviour. To say that a person can be a consistent member of the *visible* church, and not *appear* to be a member of the real church—a true disciple and follower of Christ—is a contradiction in terms.

Every one who becomes a member in full communion in the church, enters personally into the *covenant* of the church. He claims the privileges of this covenant; and as the condition of enjoying them, promises to *do* what God requires. But in his covenant dealings with men, has God ever required less than personal holiness? Or has he ever proposed a covenant into which men could *visibly* enter, without professing to be holy? In his covenant dealings with men, God certainly requires something of them, as *moral beings*; and if he does not require them to be holy, he must virtually require them to sin. But what covenant that God has ever proposed to men is of a character such as this? There can be no doubt, from the very nature and character of God, that the covenant of his church requires of those who enter into it personal holiness; and that all those must make a *profession* of holiness, either hypocritically or sincerely, who become members in communion with the church.

Again; none but a truly sanctified person can consistently perform these *sacramental acts*, which must be performed by all who are in communion with the church. Take the simple act of coming to the Lord's table, and partaking the memorials of his body and blood. What does this solemn transaction imply? Do not those who feed upon the symbol of Christ's broken body herein manifest that they feed upon him by faith? Do not those who bring to their lips the consecrated cup, and partake the emblem of a Saviour's blood, herein significantly say that their *trust* is in this precious blood? Do not those who appear at the table of Christ, and sit there in visible communion with his people, manifest in this transaction that they have, or that they trust they have, holy, spiritual communion with the saints? In other words, is not the whole transaction a symbolical *profession of faith and holiness*, such as no one can consistently make, unless he is a holy person? To me, I must acknowledge, this matter is altogether too plain to be made the subject of dispute or doubt. It ought

never to have been called in question in the church at all. No person can come to the Lord's table without making a virtual profession of piety; and no person should be encouraged or permitted to join himself to the church of God, and enter into obligations to come to his table, without furnishing satisfactory evidence that he is prepared to come in a holy, acceptable manner.

Nor should those who hold the keys of Christ's church be *superficial* or *unfaithful*, in the important work committed to their hands. They are not to believe every spirit, nor take every thing on trust. They are to *examine* those who present themselves for communion in the church, and judge, so far as they can, whether they possess the requisite qualifications. I would not, on the one hand, that these examinations should partake of an inquisitorial character; nor would I have them passed slightly and carelessly over. There are, as I have said, appropriate *marks* or *evidences* of true piety. These are laid down with sufficient clearness in the Scriptures, and they must be familiar to every one who is qualified to have the oversight of a church. Now let those who apply for admission to communion, (whether baptized or not,) be *examined* by these appropriate marks, and with a view to form a just judgment as to their spiritual state, and let those on whom it devolves to conduct these examinations be candid, but faithful in the conclusions which they form, and the advices which they give on such occasions; remembering that, if they exclude any of Christ's "little ones," they do it under the penalty of grieving the Great Master of the household, and incurring his displeasure. While, on the other hand, if they carelessly admit the unworthy to come hypocritically into the church, and pollute with unhallowed hands the symbols of Christ's body and blood, they do it at the peril, not only of the souls thus trifled with, but of the church itself.

There can scarcely be a greater injury inflicted upon the soul of an impenitent person, than to permit him to join himself to the visible church, and come to the Lord's table. The instances are very rare, in which hypocritical professors of religion are afterwards converted, and brought to the knowledge of the truth. Such persons are beset by a thousand influences, tending to blind their eyes, and harden their hearts, and impell them to persist in the delusion which they have embraced.

On the other hand, the danger to the church of admitting the unsanctified to its bosom is immense. For such persons will have no sympathy with the great objects of the church, or with its more spiritual members. They will, at best, but encumber and enfeeble the church; they may corrupt, divide, and distract it. When the church is in a state of peace and quietness, their influence will be to detract from its spirituality, and diffuse over it the spirit of slumber. And when the times of trial come, and the precious interests of the church are in danger, they will be almost sure to betray them into the hands of their enemies.—We may be told, indeed, of the efficacy of “holy discipline,” in purging the church of dangerous and troublesome members; and to a wisely and vigorously exercised discipline is certainly to be attached a high degree of importance. But then fidelity in excluding members cannot compensate for negligence in receiving them. We have no right to admit wolves into the sheep-fold, that we may display our expertness and energy in driving them out. Every experienced pastor knows how much easier it is to keep the church clear of unworthy members, than it is to exclude them,—how much easier to preserve it pure, than to purge it when once corrupted.

On the subject here treated, the church of Christ has had many and solemn warnings. Its pathway down the track of time, is all along strewed with examples, showing the danger of incautious and unauthorized admissions to its solemn rites. If the evangelical churches of the present day do not profit by these examples, and shun the rocks on which the ark of God has so often drifted, and where, had it not been for Divine faithfulness, it had long ago been utterly wrecked; they must expect, and will deserve, to bear the consequences of their presumption and their sin.

While, therefore, we would be thankful for any good advices which Bishop Smith may think proper to give us, or for any suggestions which he may feel it incumbent on him to make, we are constrained to dissent from the main positions in the article before us. We think them unscriptural, and of dangerous, ruinous influence in the church of Christ. Were they adopted in some churches, we should expect that, in the course of two or three generations, they would result in an overwhelming apostacy; so that the

few pious souls which remained would be under the necessity of separating themselves from the corrupted mass, and "forming churches out of churches."

Our best wishes for our brethren of the Episcopal church are, that they may act wisely and faithfully in regard to this solemn subject—the subject of admissions to their communion. Their standards are substantially scriptural, and we sincerely hope that, not only the letter, but the *spirit* of them may be duly regarded. We hope the venerable bishops may be careful to inquire of all who present themselves for confirmation, not only whether "they can say the creed and the ten commandments," but whether they *do* "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that they will neither follow nor be led by them;"—whether they *do purpose* "obediently to keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of their life." We can have no doubt, that the spirituality and efficiency of that important branch of the church of Christ will depend materially on the particularity and faithfulness with which these examinations are conducted.

ART. IV. IMPORTANCE OF A PURPOSE OR RESOLUTION
TO SERVE GOD.

BY REV. LEONARD WOODS, D. D.

It is plainly the duty of all Christians, and of all men, to come to a full purpose or resolution to serve God. Such was the purpose of David. "I have sworn, and I will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgments." Such was the purpose of Joshua. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." And to such a purpose Barnabas exhorted the Christians at Antioch.

Every person of mature understanding, knows what is the act of the mind, called a *purpose* or *determination* to do any particular thing. It needs no explanation. The moral quality of this mental act depends on its antecedents and circumstances, commonly called *motives*, or *grounds*. It is the consideration of these, which enables us to judge whether any purpose is morally right, or not. This is very plain, and is acknowledged in the common concerns of life. A man determines to pursue a particular study, or a particular course of conduct. But the mere knowledge of this fact leaves you in doubt, whether the determination is virtuous and commendable. And you can never be satisfied on this point, without knowing the *motives* which lead to the determination. *Why* does he determine to pursue such a study, or such a course of conduct? The answer to this inquiry, is an answer to the question, whether the determination is virtuous and holy, or not.

This principle holds with respect to purposes in religion, as much as with respect to purposes in other matters. A good man, who purposes to serve God, certainly has reasons for such a purpose. He forms it from just and sufficient motives. The great inward motive is *love to God*. It is a pious, obedient heart. The Christian who resolves in a right manner to serve God, does it because he loves God. Obedience, and a right purpose to obey, spring from the same source. The two things differ not at all in regard to the nature of the disposition implied, or the general character of the mental act. If a man loves God, he will now obey every command which is of present obligation. That is, he will now do what God now requires.

And when the same man, with the same state of mind, contemplates the requisitions of the law in regard to the future, he resolves to *obey* for the future. He resolves on a course of obedience. The motive to present obedience, and to a resolution to obey in future time, is the same, that is, *love to God*. And in proportion to the strength of his love, will be the readiness of his present obedience, and the force of his resolution to obey hereafter.

A serious and holy purpose to serve God may be considered as *love to God, and all the pious affections implied in it, concentrated in a deliberate act of the mind respecting our future conduct*. I ask, *how shall I live? What shall be my employment in all future time?* If I truly love God, my answer will be; *I will serve the Lord. It shall be my great object to do his will. Through the help of God, I will have respect to all his commandments*. Such a pious resolution may be regarded as a summary act of obedience, comprising, as far as the case admits, the essence of a life devoted to God. It is, so to speak, an anticipation of a holy life; a present act of the mind embracing our duty in all future time. And accordingly it is a kind of pledge or assurance, that we will render obedience continually and forever;—an obedience which we certainly shall render, unless our character should be changed.

Such a resolution is *highly important*, particularly as *a means of freeing the mind from fickleness, and fixing it in the steady performance of duty*.

Every good man has within him the principles of obedience, the elements of a pious life. But it is important that these elements should be properly combined, and these principles be brought to act, with united force upon the great object of pursuit. And this is done by forming a deliberate purpose to serve God. Without this, the pious affections, which are the principles of a holy life, are likely to have only a scattered and feeble influence. If any one, who has been truly converted, has not concentrated his pious dispositions in a deliberate, firm resolve to be devoted to God, he will want force of character to resist the allurements of the world, and to subdue the remaining evils in his own heart. Outward temptations, acting in conjunction with his irregular and depraved dispositions, will often prevail to turn him aside from the way of holiness. Like the "double-minded man," mentioned by an apostle, he "is

unstable in all his ways." "He is like a wave of the sea, driven of the wind and tossed." Without a fixed resolution *to live unto God*, a real Christian is, in a greater or less degree, exposed to this instability. He wants firmness and uniformity. He may have his seasons of lively affection and devout enjoyment. But there will be seasons of coldness, and backsliding, and conformity to the world, and distance from God, and disquietude, fear, and distress.—These seasons sometimes continue long, and bring the soul into the most deplorable state. Peace and hope, love and joy have departed. The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life have gotten the ascendancy. And oh! what desolation and barrenness ensue! We frequently find the professed followers of Christ in this state. There are many young Christians, who do not fulfil the hopes which their friends entertained respecting them, and which they indulged respecting themselves, at the commencement of their religious life. They are not active, growing Christians. They do not exhibit the humility, the tenderness, the zeal and watchfulness, to which their profession binds them. They are called to a holy, heavenly life; but their life is not holy and heavenly. They are called to bear the likeness of Christ. But they give little or no evidence of this likeness. They are called to be fruitful in good works. But in this also they are deficient. Now this lamentable state is, in no small degree, owing to the want of a fixed purpose to be devoted to God. Let Christians, then, especially young Christians, take into view the sinfulness and wretchedness of such a condition, and their exposure to fall into it. Let them meditate upon the high commands of the sacred scriptures, which require them to set their affections on things above, to strive against sin, to deny themselves, to be watchful, and diligent, and pure, and to walk with God. Let them consider the precious promises. Let them dwell in deep reflection upon the vanity and misery of a worldly life, and the blessedness of uniform, devoted piety; upon the favour of God, which attends a holy life, and upon the wrath of God, which attends a life of sin. Let them look forward to a dying bed, to the judgment day, and the eternal world. Let them ponder these things, till their hearts are duly affected. Then, with cordial love to Christ and his cause, looking to God, and relying upon his all-sufficient grace, let them come to a deliberate, solemn

resolution, that they will walk in newness of life. Let them bind themselves to the Lord in an everlasting covenant.—With sincerity of heart let them decide upon a life of self-denial, watchfulness, and prayer. Let them form the purpose strongly, and with an undivided mind, that they will make religion their great business, and that nothing shall turn them aside from this reasonable and happy work. Let them form such a purpose, in such a manner, and faithfully adhere to it; and they will find it the commencement of a new era in their christian life. Henceforward their path will be plain and bright. They will know what they are living for, and what they have to do. They will be free from a divided mind, and from all the perplexity occasioned by it. They will have the comfort of pursuing *one object*, and that the greatest and best in the universe. This unity of purpose and unity of object, will impart moral strength to their character. So that although temptation or persecution beset them, though any trouble or danger rise up before them, they are not to be turned aside from the right way. “With purpose of heart they cleave to the Lord.” They are fortified against whatever would draw or drive them from the service of Christ. Their heart is fixed. With unvarying decision they say to every tempter; “*I have sworn and I will perform it, that I will keep the righteous judgments of my God.*” *I am a servant of the king of kings. At his command I am engaged in a great and exalted work, and I cannot come down.*—The Christian, who thus deliberately and firmly resolves to be wholly devoted to God, moves forward steadily in his heavenly course. He is strong to act for God, because all his own powers, aided by a power infinitely superior, are enlisted in the work. He is strong to resist temptation, because he will not parley with it. He is a constant, growing, useful Christian, and his light shines brighter and brighter to the perfect day.

But it is impossible for me adequately to set forth the importance of our being fully resolved, and having our heart unalterably fixed, in the work of God. See, then, the importance of our having such views of the divine character and law, of the evil of sin, and the worth of the soul, and our obligations to the Saviour, and the importance also of such religious impressions and exercises, as tend most effectually to bring us to a full and invariable purpose, that we will obey God, and that this and nothing else shall be our

great business as long as we live. Superficial views and general convictions of divine truth, transient impressions, and slight experiences will never bring us to this. Strong impressions, deep experiences, powerful influences of the Spirit, and powerful actings of love, gratitude and faith, are necessary to bring us up to the requisite determination. In the religious life of James Brainerd Taylor, there was a happy period, in which, under the influence of such views and exercises as I have mentioned, he deliberately decided to come out from the world and live unto God. Before this he was often wavering, and easily turned aside. But afterwards he lived to purpose. No temptation could move him. Every day turned to account, because it was employed in his one great work of growing in grace, and promoting the interests of Christ's kingdom.

Let Christians in every situation come to a sincere and firm resolve, that they will renounce the world; that they will regard no iniquity in their heart; that they will in all things follow Jesus and make his glory and his holy service first and last in their affections;—let Christians do this and what spiritual prosperity would they enjoy! To what a high measure of usefulness would they attain! How would their light shine! And what a day of glory would soon be ushered in upon the church of Christ!

But there is a purpose or resolution of another kind, often spoken of; the purpose of an impenitent sinner to repent, and of an unbeliever, to believe,—of an enemy to God, to love God,—of an unrenewed sinner, to become a Christian. A purpose like this is frequently formed by unconverted men, especially when their consciences are awakened, and their fears of future misery excited. It is evident that such a purpose is widely different from the pious purpose of Christians to live a devout and holy life. It is different as to its *nature*; as to its *motives*; as to its *primary and real object*; and as to its *influence*.

It is different as to its *nature*. The purpose of the Christian is a holy purpose. But the purpose of the impenitent sinner is not holy. The one is the act of a *sanctified*, the other of an *unsanctified* mind. They may both be called by the same name; but their moral qualities are as different, as the persons to whom they belong. Good fruit cannot come from a bad tree.

These two kinds of purpose spring from different *motives*; and this also shows their different natures. The purpose of an unrenewed man to become a Christian, springs from a desire for his own individual happiness, from mere convictions of conscience, or from a dread of future punishment. But the purpose of a good man to live right, is prompted, as we have seen, by love to God and man, by a taste for religious duties; in a word, by the influence of holy affections. But an impenitent sinner has no holy affections, from which a holy purpose can arise.

These purposes differ also as to their *object*. The primary and real object, which the purpose of an impenitent sinner fixes upon, is not the same as that of a good man. The unrenewed sinner resolves to repent, to believe and to obey. But the *real* object of his contemplations and his purpose, is not *evangelical repentance, faith, and obedience*, but some wrong image of them in his mind, or some outward conduct attending them. We are taught, that the natural man does not even *discern* the things of the spirit,—that he cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned. So when the unrenewed sinner resolves to seek after future blessedness, it is not the real, holy blessedness of heaven, which he looks at as the object of his desires, the end of his pursuit, but a happiness suited to his taste.

Finally; the purpose of the impenitent sinner differs from that of the devout Christian, as to its *influence*. The determination of a good man to devote himself to God, has a salutary effect upon his conduct. It leads to a holy life. Such a life is the natural development of the principles involved in a holy purpose. But what is the influence of an impenitent sinner's purpose to become a Christian? It is clear, that every mental act, taken by itself, tends to strengthen and perpetuate the dispositions which are exercised. And in this case, there are no dispositions exercised, but those which belong to man in his natural, unsanctified state. No effect then is produced by the purpose referred to, but increasing the strength of the natural dispositions. It is contrary to all the principles of mental science to suppose, that a deliberate purpose of the mind, in which particular affections are exercised, tends, by itself, separately from the special influence of the Spirit, to bring up other and essentially different affections, and those which the

mind never before put forth. And to rely upon a purpose springing from mere natural principles, to produce holy affection and a holy life, is to rely upon the unsanctified act of the sinner to do the peculiar work of the divine Spirit.

It is implied in the foregoing remarks, that the purpose of an unrenewed sinner, springing from such motives, and being of such a nature, has no spiritual excellence, or moral goodness in it. It has nothing of the nature of religion. An unrenewed sinner's purpose to repent, is not repentance, his purpose to believe, is not faith, and his purpose to obey, is not obedience. While the unregenerate sinner resolves to repent, he continues impenitent, *i. e.* he refuses to do what he resolves to do. While he resolves to believe in Christ, he refuses to believe; and while he resolves to obey, he refuses to obey. A sinner, while resolving in this manner, is far from commencing religion, or making any approximation towards it.

It would be easy to illustrate these remarks by citing a great variety of instances in which unrenewed sinners have resolved to attend to religion, and to become Christians. But I shall mention only a few, and those taken from the memoirs of Halyburton, lately abridged and published by Dr. Humphrey.—When Halyburton was at sea, in early youth, he had many serious reflections, and says: “I *promised* that, should I be at land, I would live better than formerly. I *engaged* to keep all God's commandments. My mother told me I was in a mistake, and should not hold there. But there was no persuading me of this. I multiplied *resolutions*, and doubted not as to the performance.” But he says; “no sooner was I come to land, and settled at Rotterdam, than I forgot all my resolutions and promises.” Afterwards, when pressed with convictions, he says; “I endeavoured to relieve myself by promises of abstaining from those sins which more directly troubled me.—I took sanctuary in resolutions of inquiring into the Lord's mind, and complying.” At a later period he was led to attend very carefully upon the forms of religion. He prayed night and morning; and at other times retired and wept in secret, and read and prayed, and resolved to live otherwise than he had done. But this goodness was as the morning cloud and early dew. Again, he says; “Finding no peace in any of these courses, I resolved to enter into covenant with the Lord; and accordingly I wrote and subscribed

a solemn covenant whereby I bound myself to be his: as the Israelites, when under the awful impressions of Sinai, said,—all that the Lord our God shall say unto us, we will hear and do it. When I had done this, I concluded all was right, and found a kind of present peace.” But God discovered to him the treachery of his engagements, and let him see that his heart was not sound, that there were secret reserves in his engagements, and that there were some sins from which his heart was not divorced! Again, having deep convictions of his own depravity, he *resolved* and *engaged* with much solemnity to obey God, and for some time was very strict in performing his duties. But he found he was influenced by a self-righteous spirit. He says; “I engaged to live a new life with an old heart; not being yet made to see that, unless the tree is made good, the fruit cannot be good.” Finally, on a time set apart for prayer, he solemnly bound himself to God, to walk in his ways. He said, “I will serve the Lord.” But he was still a stranger to the power of religion. He was finally brought to renounce all these methods of relief, and to submit to the gospel way of salvation by grace.

Every one must see that such purposes and resolutions to serve God, as Halyburton formed, and such as unconverted men now frequently form, have nothing of the nature of holiness. And it appears equally evident, that such resolutions have no influence to produce holiness. It is contrary to the obvious nature of the mind to suppose, that any act of an unrenewed man can produce a renewal, or that any determination of an unholy heart can have an efficacy to originate holiness. Who can admit the thought, that an impenitent, selfish, worldly heart is able to form a purpose, or put forth an act, which shall give birth to a heart of penitence, and of benevolent, heavenly affection? That the carnal mind which is enmity against God, can by its own agency, cause love to spring up? This is the very thing which the Apostle says cannot be. “The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” If the carnal mind could be subject to the divine law, and if they that are in the flesh, that is, in their natural state, could please God, there would be no need of being born of the Spirit.

Now have we not reason for the painful apprehension, that multitudes of sinners fall into a fatal mistake on this

subject? A fatal mistake it must be, if they suppose that any purpose of theirs, springing from an unsanctified heart, has any real goodness in it, or that it is any evidence of piety, or that they can safely rely upon it as having any power to improve their moral state. Suppose a sinner, under a strong excitement of conscience, and fear, and self-love, but with little knowledge of his own heart, resolves that he will repent, and henceforth live as a Christian. Does such a resolution constitute conversion? Is it any satisfactory *evidence* of conversion? By no means. Under the influence of the same motives, he may attend to the various external duties of religion, and enjoy a kind of pleasure in them, and may engage in various plans of benevolence, and make the impression on the minds of others, that he is a sincere and growing Christian. All this he may do in consequence of his resolution to be a Christian. But if he relies upon such a resolution, or the fruits of it, as constituting religion, or as an evidence of religion, he deceiveth himself. For the unrenewed sinner's resolution to repent, is a very different thing from repentance; and his purpose to be a Christian is a very different thing from *being* a Christian, and has no natural connection with it.

Hence we see how dangerous a practice it must be, for ministers of the gospel to represent the purpose or resolution of an unrenewed sinner to be a Christian, as constituting conversion, or as an evidence of conversion. A purpose to serve God, springing from love to God, a purpose to forsake sin, springing from real hatred of sin, and a purpose to attend to the duties of religion, from a cordial delight in those duties, is indeed an evidence of conversion. It is one of the ways in which a new heart develops itself. But what fatal delusion shall we occasion, if we speak of any resolution arising from mere convictions of conscience or from self-love, or from any natural affection, as having the nature of religion, or as a proof of regeneration! If we would speak of a purpose to serve God, which may safely be considered as a part of true piety, or as an evidence of it, we must take special care to show that it is a purpose which springs from holy motives.

It has been the practice of some ministers, who have appeared desirous of doing good, to exhort sinners to form a *purpose* to repent and believe, a *resolution* to turn from sin to God: and to speak of this as constituting the sub-

stance of a saving change ;—and to do all this so as to imply that the purpose or resolution intended, is one which springs from mere natural affections, and which a person may form in a state of unregeneracy. They labour to bring the sinner to adopt such a resolution, and regard this as the grand object to be accomplished. And if any one says, he thus resolves, they look upon it as evidence of his being born again, and forthwith count him as a convert.

I have already intimated, that this practice is dangerous. I now say, it is wholly *unscriptural*. To what did the prophets and apostles exhort sinners in order to salvation ? They exhorted them to repent, to believe, to pray, to seek God, to put away sin, to love and follow Christ, &c. But when did they direct sinners to *resolve* to do these duties ? And who would ever think of directing men in any case, to resolve to do that which is strictly of present obligation, and which urgently calls for present performance ? If a friend of yours were in a house on fire, and must instantly escape or perish in the flames, would you go about to persuade him to *form* a *purpose* or *resolution* to leave the house ? Or if your friend were drowning, would you call upon him to *resolve* to take hold of the rope which was let down for his rescue ? Or if he had unwittingly swallowed poison, would you exhort him to *resolve* to take the medicine which was the only thing that could save him from sudden death ? When the jailor felt himself to be perishing, and inquired what he should do to be saved ; did the apostle direct him to form a *purpose* or *resolution* to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ ? And does God, in giving the first and great command, which comprises all the rest, say ; “Thou shalt *resolve* to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart ?” and in giving the second command,—“Thou shalt *resolve* to love thy neighbour as thyself ?” *Love itself* is the thing that is due from us. It is a matter of *present* obligation ; and of course is an *unqualified, absolute* requisition of *love itself* ; and as far as the exercise of love is a present duty, the command cannot be understood to leave any place for a purpose or resolution antecedent to the exercise of love. See how the affectionate, urgent exhortation to sinners, contained in Isa. 55, would be enfeebled and paralyzed, if you should put it in the form which we are considering. “Ho every one that thirsteth, *resolve* to come to the waters : make it your

serious *purpose* to come, and buy, and eat; yea, *resolve* to come and buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread? *Resolve* to hearken diligently unto me, and to eat that which is good. Form the solemn *purpose* to incline your ear and come unto me. *Resolve* to hear, and your soul shall live. *Determine* to seek the Lord while he may be found, to call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked *purpose* to forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him *resolve* to return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him." The precepts of the New Testament would be affected in the same manner; and those which require repentance and faith of sinners in the first instance, not less than any others. Why, then, adopt a mode of address which is so at variance with the word of God? If God requires repentance and faith and love and obedience, let his ambassadors require the same, taking care to substitute nothing else in their place. Do you say, a purpose to repent and believe and love is essential to the exercise of repentance, faith and love, and must always come before them? My answer is, that this is wholly without proof, and is contrary to the laws of the mind, and the consciousness of enlightened Christians generally. Do you say that by a purpose to repent and love God, you do not mean an act of the will which is distinct from repentance, but one which *involves* repentance, so that requiring the purpose is requiring repentance? I reply, first, that according to the established sense of words, a purpose to do any thing is distinct from doing it, and may take place without it. Secondly, if you mean to require repentance, why not require it plainly and directly? Why make use of words which would seem to imply that you have something else in view? Thirdly, the example of the Apostles is obligatory upon us, unless it can be shown that the character of man, and the laws of the mind, are so changed, as to call for an alteration in the mode of addressing sinners. Is it said, that sinners, while unrenewed, are not capable of exercising saving repentance and faith and love, and that we ought to require something first, which they can do in their natural state? To this I reply, that most of those, who at the present day, use the mode of address referred to, do not admit that sinners are subject to any incapacity, or want of power, to do what God requires. So that nothing need be said to remove

such a difficulty as this from their minds. And if there are any, who consider the inability of sinners to obey the Divine commands, as a reason for withholding or varying those commands, or as an exemption from present obligation to obey; my answer is, that by such a position they virtually impeach the character of the law and the Lawgiver, and undertake to be more just than God. Do you say, that a resolution to repent and obey is in fact frequently followed by repentance and obedience? I answer, it is still more frequently followed by impenitence and disobedience. Do you say, the purpose you mean to inculcate is a pious purpose, springing from right motives? Then take care to *explain* your meaning, and leave no one to suppose that he does any part of the work which God requires, by a resolution which springs from an unholy heart. God requires that all men should be holy. The requisition is just and good. And neither the deep depravity of men, nor their entire dependence on the special agency of the Spirit, interferes in the least with their perfect obligation to comply with the requisition. Why not press this obligation upon them? God requires them to repent, and to repent without any delay. This requisition too is perfectly right. And there are many reasons, and reasons of inconceivable weight and urgency, to induce them now to repent. Why not present these reasons, and labour to persuade them to *do this very duty at once*? Why put any thing, or seem to put any thing else in the place of it? God says; "Speak my words to them." Here is the sum of what we are to do as gospel ministers. We should labour to come up fully to this requirement, by declaring all the counsel of God. We should take care not to go beyond this requirement by adding to God's words. We should declare the truth to sinners with the feelings which the truth itself prompts, and inculcate their duty with that spirit of love which appeared in him, whose servants we are. And all this we should do with cordial reliance on Divine grace, remembering that, whoever may plant or water, *it is God that gives the increase*.

Finally; it is our duty at the present day to take special pains to show how hazardous it is to depend on any purpose which originates in an impenitent, unrenewed, selfish heart. Many persons speak peace to themselves, because they have *resolved* to repent and to be Christians. They engraft a hope of heaven upon an unsanctified resolution.

And when they once hide themselves in this refuge of lies, it is extremely difficult to dislodge them. A deceived heart hath turned them aside. They think they are something, when they are nothing.

ART. V. REVIEW OF HODGE ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

By GILBERT McMASTER, D. D. Duquesburgh, N. Y.

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, designed for students of the English Bible. By Charles Hodge, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Philadelphia. Published by Grigg and Elliot, No. 9 North Fourth street. 1835, pp. 588.

BETWEEN the works and the word of God, ingenious men have often remarked a striking analogy. In the details as well as in the outlines of this analogy, we are able to trace those impressions of the divine hand, and those features of the divine character, which, to our minds, identify the Creator of nature and the author of the Bible.

In the field and in the forest, upon the mountain and in the valley, the Botanist will find all the materials of the botanic garden; but then he will not find his classes, orders, genera, and species, collated and distinctly arranged in their respective plots. To find them, in order that he may thus arrange them, he must traverse the fields and the forest; examine the valley, and ascend the mountains; observe with discrimination, and gather with care the objects of his pursuit. For these toils the lover of nature will find a compensation in the great variety of relations presented to his view, and in the profusion of beauties and riches scattered around his path, which are sought for in vain in the artificial arrangements of the gardener's beds. Neither the views of a vigorous vitality, nor the enjoyments of the numerous and varied connexions of the products of nature, found in her own unmeasured plains and on her elevated hills, are furnished in the order and system of the garden, how beautiful soever, otherwise, that inclosure may be.

It is thus in the Book of God's revealed will. In its pages of light we have no technical system. The materi-

als of a system are, indeed, very abundant. The illuminating Spirit of inspiration has spread out the pages of the sacred volume, and as a mean of sanctifying the souls of men, has made it their duty and privilege to examine with diligence, earnestness, and solemnity of mind, the contents of those pages. The several parts of the revelation which they embrace are in perfect accordance with one another; and much of their beauty and efficiency lies in the enlightened perception of this harmony, and in the application of the several truths in their appropriate relations. The first principles of Christianity though comparatively few, are, nevertheless, like the letters of the alphabet, capable of indefinite combinations with each other and with the objects to which they are related; and in every form of combination they present so much that is peculiar and deeply interesting, as almost to justify in each presentation the appellation of a new principle. To discover these principles, whether in reference to the articles of faith or the duties of religion and morality, we must neither confine ourselves to abstract propositions, nor limit ourselves to express commands. Beyond these we must go to the features of character delineated in the Book of God; to facts in life and events of providence there recorded. These exhibited in a thousand forms, and modified by innumerable circumstances and relations, unfold principles and instructions of deepest interest to man. These principles stand in appropriate relationships to each other, and to ascertain their connexions and relative bearings, is the business of the theological student.

This we can by no means view in the light of an useless or unimportant labour. Whilst guarding against the danger of forming a system in anticipation of supernatural revelation, and then having recourse to that revelation to compel its testimony in favor of our theory, it would be no trivial error should we disregard the harmony of the principles of revealed truth, and satisfy ourselves with a view of them as insulated facts. There is a proportion—*αναλογια*—of the Faith of the Gospel, which involves the idea of system; a disregard of which will raise very great obstacles in the way of a sound and satisfactory *exegesis* of the sacred Scriptures, and will greatly retard the Christian's progress in his advances toward that acquisition of Bible knowledge, which is demanded for efficient christian action. Let, however, care be taken, that this *proportion*

of faith be deduced from the Scriptures themselves. The value of a compend of first principles, in the study of every other department of science, is well known, and why it should be contemned or overlooked in Theology, no good reason we think, can be assigned. The material for such a compend is abundantly furnished in the Bible, and when judiciously formed and employed, it aids in the progress of Bible investigation. With a view to such aid that chief of Theologians and prince of Scripture Expositors, *Calvin*, composed in an extended view of that early document, the apostle's creed, his invaluable "Institutes."

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans is, to some extent, an exception to the above remarks. In this letter the great outlines of a theological system are distinctly marked, and the filling up is as complete as either the epistolary form of composition, or the object of the sacred writer required. It is matter of sincere gratulation, that, for some years past, public attention has been invited, and continues to be invited to the study of this Epistle. The importance of its matter and the difficulty of its exposition have been generally admitted; and the admission of the difficulty of success has probably contributed its share in the production of that comparative neglect with which, we are sorry to say, this deeply interesting portion of the New Testament, in certain quarters has been treated. Among the indications of good and ill, of which our age is so very prolific, we are inclined to hail as one of promise, the aroused desire to understand the apostle of the Gentiles, in this chief production of his inspired pen. In aid of the object of this desire, Calvin is brought from the obscurity in which he has been too long suffered to remain, and in a modern dress is introduced to the fellowship of the English reader. Tholuck at Halle, on the European continent, and in our own country, in rapid succession, the commentaries of Stuart and Hodge have made their appearance. These commentators have laboured, indeed, with various success; but all of them with advantage to the cause of sacred literature.—Whatever provokes men to read, study, and understand the epistle to the Romans, or any other portion of the divine word, so imperfectly understood as that epistle generally is, does service to the cause of religious knowledge. The exceptionable, or more imperfect work will call forth into action those who can do it better. Acceptable com-

mentaries, too, have a tendency to bring back to the pulpits of our country, and to make fashionable, the good and profitable old custom of the Sabbath morning *lecture*,—the exposition, in order, Sabbath after Sabbath, of a portion of some book of Scripture till the whole shall be finished,—explaining its difficult terms, pointing out the relation of its several parts, stating its doctrines, and showing its practical use ; a custom which has extensively, and for the interests of Bible knowledge and a solid acquaintance with true religion very unhappily, too long yielded its place in the sanctuary to the little fancy piece, the vehement but ill-sustained exhortation or the intellect-destroying and death-producing vapid declamation. How very different from, and superior to these, the exhibitions of truth deduced immediately from the fountain of truth itself, pervaded by that fullness of spiritual vitality which gives life to the soul.

Our purpose at present is to notice, and that very briefly, the “commentary” of Professor Hodge. We very cordially welcome this work, as a valuable acquisition to the Theological literature of our country. Without pretension it evinces research, and without the angry spirit of ill-conducted controversy, it repels what the author views as error, and maintains with firmness what he believes to be truth. It gives us great satisfaction to say, that in the attention we have been able to give to the work, we have not discovered any doctrinal error. Professor H. is an advocate of the old Reformation views of the doctrines of grace, as these are set forth in the symbols of the reformed churches. His exposition will be read with advantage by every one who is desirous to understand the apostle Paul, in this portion of the sacred volume. It is a sound and able work, and may, very confidently be recommended to the attention and regard of every class of readers. That all the forms of expression employed in the course of the work are equally happy and appropriate, we need not affirm ; or that the author has seized with equal power, the spirit of every text in this epistle, none will expect. A faultless exposition of a scripture so profound is too much to require of any uninspired man. This remark will, we trust, guard us against misapprehension, in those which follow.

In a compendious “Introduction,” we have given us an outline of the character of Paul ;—a view of the origin and condition of the church at Rome ;—of the time and

place of the composition of the Epistle ;—of the proof of its authenticity ; and lastly an analysis of its contents. In this analysis, the author considers the Epistle as consisting of three parts. "The first which includes the first eight chapters, is occupied in the discussion of the doctrine of justification and its consequences. The second, embracing chapters 9, 10, 11, treats of the calling of the Gentiles, the rejection, and future conversion of the Jews. The third consists of practical exhortations, and salutations to the Christians at Rome. p. 13.

Analysis, in this instance, is, perhaps, rather a matter of taste, than of great utility. To that given by Prof. H. no great objection can be made, as it is, in its parts, sufficiently comprehensive, and to a wearisome detail exceptions may very justly be taken. Without attaching too much importance to the matter, we would prefer some such distribution of the epistle as the following: After noticing the Apostle's introduction, which we are inclined to think is found in the first fifteen verses, together with the general statement of his subject in verses 16, 17, and 18, he gives,—

I. In the remaining part of chapter i. and to verse 21, of chapter iii. a view of man's fallen state, in which he establishes the truth of the guilt, depravity, and helplessness of both Jews and Gentiles.

II. The discussion of Justification, through faith in the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The state of fallen man being unfolded, the way was opened for the introduction of the doctrine of the satisfaction of the Redeemer, in order to the justification of the believing sinner. This discussion occupies that portion of the epistle between chap. iii. 20, and the end of the fifth chapter.

III. Chapters vi. vii. viii. to verse 29, embrace the doctrine of sanctification with its issuing in glory.

IV. From verse 29, of chapter viii. to the end of chap. xi. a view is presented of the sovereign purpose of Divine mercy in behalf of ruined sinners, together with an outline of the plan of administration fixed in the sovereign wisdom and goodness of God, giving to the believer assurance of the infallible accomplishment of the designs of grace. In illustration of the subject, the rejection of the Jews, in accordance with the foresight of Israelitish prophecy ; the calling of the Gentiles, and the restoration of Israel to their church state, when the day of the fulness of the Gentiles shall have dawned.

V. Chapters xii. xiii. xiv. and xv. to ver. 13, contain a distinct summary of Christian duty.

1. In chapter xii, there is exhibited a comprehensive view of Christian obligation, personal and social; inclusive of a distinct reference to ecclesiastical officers and their peculiar duties.

2. Chapter xiii. brings before us the Divine authority of civil government, and the duty of Christians, as well as others, toward legitimate authority, in the respective countries where they may reside.

3. In chapter xiv. xv. to ver. 13, we find the great principles and leading rules of Church Fellowship, in which is prescribed the course to be pursued, in the formation and maintenance of ecclesiastical relations.

4. The remaining portion of the letter is occupied with various incidental remarks, salutations, and the conclusion.

Whatever may be the form of analysis, it affects not the substance of the exposition. That is, certainly, of greatest consequence, and will be found in the progress and details of this work, in which great and leading principles of the religion of Jesus Christ find a prominent and commanding place, and with the filling up of which outline we have found no material discrepancy. To enter into minute discussions, or to take up in detailed remark, any of these leading doctrines of the Gospel, is beyond our present intention. A reference to a few of them is all that is purposed, and this is attempted with the design of recommending the careful perusal of the work itself. Among the doctrines upon which the author appears to lay special weight, are the following :

I. The eternal filiation of our blessed Redeemer. Prof. H. decidedly takes the ground that the idea of the *Sonship* of Jesus Christ necessarily embraces that of Deity. *Godhead* is his, because he is the Son of God,—the *only begotten* of the Father. To us, indeed, it seems passing strange, that any should consider necessary Deity as the prerogative of the *ὁ Λόγος*,—a denomination so obviously seeming to designate the second person of the adorable Trinity, as the efficient agent in the revelation of *JEHOVAH* to the various tribes of his rational family, and especially to man; rather than of the *ὁ θεός*, which so naturally indicates the essential necessary possession of Godhead, in virtue of the filial relation of the Son to the Eternal Father. The exposi-

tion of ver. 4, chap. i., found in this volume, will, we trust, be satisfactory to such as may have entertained doubt upon the subject. We deeply regret that any advocate of the Supreme Divinity of our Redeemer should have, at any time, hesitated upon the truth of his *eternal* and *necessary* Sonship. We still believe the denial of this truth to be dangerous to the faith of the Christian profession. What idea of the distinct personality of his Saviour, has the simple hearted professor, beyond that of his Sonship? When we have succeeded in persuading him that Jesus of Nazareth, *as Son of God*, is not supremely Divine,—equal with God the Father,—the work of the Socinian, who may soon follow us, will not be found of difficult accomplishment.

We cannot avoid the conclusion, that some good men, in their speculations upon this subject, have pushed too far the supposed points of analogy between human and divine *γενεσις*. The danger of pushing analogy, in reasoning, into the place of proof, is not unknown; and the absurdities that follow the carrying of illustration by it as a help, beyond the proper bounds, are in abundance before us. It might, too, not be amiss for some ingenious speculators upon the mysteries of the Divinity, whilst employing analogies derived from created nature, to stop ere they advance too far, and inquire how much they really know of that which they put in requisition for the explanation of the more hidden subject. Did we bear in mind the very narrow limits that set bounds to our knowledge of what goes to the constitution of the relationships of paternity and filiation among men, we might be saved from some rash conclusions, and from some needless perplexities upon the subject before us. Did we ascertain more precisely the true extent of our information on the subject of this department of physiological inquiry, it is very probable we should, in reference to the second person in Deity, utter and hear fewer suggestions of *communication, derivation, dependence, inferiority*; all which terms, if not limited to the humanity, or mediatorial character of our Lord, are offences against the acknowledged faith of the Church of God. Upon certain points, analogy was intended to shed a divine light; but the analogy, when pushed beyond its authorized bounds, casts a shadow of darkness under which every object becomes indistinct. In what, among men, does the personality of the son depend upon his father? What of the

personality of the son is a *derivative* of his father? In what is the son, as a human person, inferior to his father? On the part of the son, observation does not justify the idea of inferiority, in any essential attribute of human nature, to the father; physiological investigations authorize not the conclusion of inferiority; and in the organization of society, humanity in the son is guarded by as many legal provisions as it is in the father. In reference to our Redeemer the case is plain. In calling himself *the Son of God*, while sojourning among men on earth, he was understood as asserting his equality with God. The inference he did not deny. Upon this subject, however, the *τις*, *the how or why?* is the difficulty. What is his NAME, or his son's NAME, if thou canst tell? Fancy here should be restrained. In inquiries concerning the structure of nature, fancy may flutter around the blossom of the rose, imagination may form its theory of geology from a partial knowledge of facts respecting the strata of the earth, or arrange its system of physiology by suppositions ill sustained, and if kept in their own place, such theories may be harmless; but this they cannot be, when employed as the measure by which we would fathom the deep mysteries of God. The whole limit of the mountain where the Divinity dwells, is holy, and in approaching his temple, on the summit of that mountain, a voice reaches the ear, and in the warning language of admonition, addresses us, saying—*Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God,—be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.* When God, in condescension to our weakness, speaks to us of his attributes and relations, after the manner of men, it becomes us to separate, as far as possible, from the ideas communicated, all that pertains to, or that marks the imperfection of the creature.

Upon this subject, Prof. H. indulges in no rash speculations, nor does he attempt any theory, the tendency of which would be either to amuse or perplex his reader.

2. The righteousness of Jesus Christ, consisting of his obedience unto and in death; or, which is the same thing, his obedience in life and propitiatory sufferings unto death, as the substitutionary sacrifice for sin, which enter into the constitution of the mediatorial righteousness of our Redeemer, Prof. H. brings distinctly and decidedly into

view, in accordance with his text, as the immediate, proper, and only ground of the sinners justification ; to the exclusion of all works, dispositions, and personal excellencies, whatever, as constituting a reason for the bestowment of pardon, acceptance, and eternal life upon guilty man. Faith has assigned to it its proper place, that of a divinely appointed and provided means, which embraces, or appropriates, the righteousness of the Saviour to the soul. Between the justifying sentence of God and that righteousness, as its exclusive foundation, reason, or meritorious cause, there is nothing intermediate. We are glad to find this fundamental point so clearly stated, inasmuch as we have some reason to apprehend, that the *Neonomian* view of the way of justification has, for some time past, been making somewhat silently, perhaps, its way into the creed of professors deemed otherwise evangelical.

Against the danger, too, into which some respectable and orthodox men seem likely sometimes to fall, Prof. H. guards with very laudable circumspection : we refer to the importance of faith in the doctrine of justification. Much is said, and truly said, of the imputation of the righteousness of the Redeemer as the ground of pardon, acceptance, and eternal life, while faith in that righteousness, in order to its imputation, is occasionally not so distinctly or emphatically noticed as it ought to be. Faith is not the righteousness by which we are justified ; yet without faith there is no justification. It is by faith that the righteousness of Jesus becomes actually ours, and because it is thus ours, it is placed to our account for justification.

It is well known, that, without a formal rejection of the righteousness of the Redeemer, as the procuring cause of this primary blessing of the new covenant, there may be such forms of introduction given to intermediate circumstances as will, in a measure, place it out of sight. This will always be an evil, attended with great danger to the honour of the Saviour, and the peace of the souls of men. It is not enough to affirm that human works, of themselves, cannot merit pardon and eternal life. This, in her darkest hour, Rome could and did affirm. It is not doing strict justice to that apostate and very corrupt Church, to charge her with authorizing the declaration that simply in themselves, "good works merit heaven." This position, though held by individuals of that communion, has been condemned

by more than one of her popes. Whatever merit she ascribes to good works, is, in her decrees, admitted to be ascribable to the mercy of God, expressed in the gracious promise of the new covenant. A careful perusal of the decree of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent, on the subject of justification, will show that the doctrine of that Church differs not, essentially, from that of those protestants who put faith, with its accompanying graces and virtues, in the place of the works of the law; not as meritorious in themselves, but as accepted of God for Christ's sake, and, thus only, making justification to us gratuitous.

Upon this subject we regret to find in circulation, among the churches, such instructions as the following, addressed to inquiring sinners: "God has been pleased to appoint (faith) as a condition on which men may be treated as righteous. It expresses a state of mind which is demonstrative of love to God; of affection for his cause and character;—and is, therefore, that state to which he has been graciously pleased to promise pardon and acceptance." What! Faith the condition of justification, as it indicates a mind in possession of holy affections, constituting *that state* to which is made the gracious promise of pardon and acceptance? But we, perhaps, misunderstand such writers; we do not, therefore, assert that their doctrine would have passed current at Trent, when Rome sealed her apostacy from Jesus, the Mediator between God and man. Yet we may affirm that at Geneva, in the days of Calvin, it would have been stamped with the mark of reprobation; and at Wittenberg, by Luther and Melancthon, it would have met with no better reception. Upon this vital point, Prof. H. is not likely to be misunderstood. In his pages, no slips or oversights of the above description will be found.

3. The guilt, depravity, misery, and helplessness of mankind, as stated by the Apostle, the commentator does not conceal. He states them in their connexion with the first transgression of Adam, as the covenant representative of his posterity. But, upon these points, we are forbidden by our limits to venture a remark.

4. The nature and necessity of personal holiness, together with the merciful provision of God for securing it to every believer, and its proper place and influence when secured, are brought prominently into view. No room is

left to the objector against the doctrine of justification as stated in this volume, to allege that the claims of obedience in life are forgotten.

5. In the course of this work, we find a distinct representation of the true believer, drawn in the colours of inspired light. He is indeed holy, but he is not yet, nor while upon earth, will he be perfect in holiness. He is really a saint, though an imperfect one. We are glad to find the humble, ingenuous, struggling, penitent, and confiding character, delineated in the seventh chapter, so well vindicated, and so ably rescued out of the powerful hands of those, who, under the influence of misapprehension, would affix to it the seal of reprobation, and consign it to the doom and companionship of the damned. The character of the saint here drawn, has been the means by which the Spirit of grace has sustained in hope, many an humble and sorrowing heart. Luther felt this, when, in his own strong and somewhat unguarded manner, he said, "It is a great comfort to us, when we hear that even the saints, who have the spirit of God, do sin; which comfort they would take from us, who say that the saints do not sin."* The argument of Professor H., we cannot insert at large; and yet we feel it would not be altogether just to the reader who has not seen the work, to deprive him of a specimen of his reasoning. The following is his third remark pp. 300, 301.

III. While there is nothing in the sentiments of this passage which a true Christian may not adopt, there is much which cannot be asserted by any unrenewed man. As far as this point is concerned, it depends, of course, on the correct interpretation of the several expressions employed by the apostle. 1. What is the true meaning of the phrases "inward man" and "law of the mind," when opposed to "the flesh" and "the law in the members?" The sense of these expressions is to be determined by their use in other passages, or if they do not elsewhere occur, by the meaning attached to those which are obviously substituted for them. As from the similarity of the passages, it can hardly be questioned, that what Paul here calls "the inward man" and "law of the mind," he, in Gal. 5: 17 and elsewhere, calls "the Spirit;" it is plain that he intends, by these terms, to designate the soul considered as renewed, in opposition to the "flesh," or the soul considered as destitute of divine influence. 2. It is not in accordance with the scriptural representation of the wicked, to describe them as consenting to the law of God, as hating sin and struggling against it, groaning under it as a tyrant's yoke, as delighting in the law of God, i. e. in holiness; doing all this, not as men, but as men viewed in a particular aspect, as to the inward or new man. This is not the scriptural representation of the na-

* Comment on Gal. ii. 12.

tural man, who does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, and cannot know them, 1 Cor. 2: 14. On the contrary, the carnal mind is enmity against God and his law. They, therefore, who are in the flesh, that is, who have this carnal mind, hate and oppose the law, Rom. 8: 7, 8. The expressions here used by the apostle, are such as, throughout the scriptures, are used to describe the exercises of the pious, "whose delight is in the law of the Lord," Ps. 1: 2, 3. Not only do these particular expressions show that the speaker is a true Christian, but the whole conflict here described is such as is peculiar to the sincere believer. There is, indeed, in the natural man, something very analogous to this, when his conscience is enlightened, and his better feelings come into collision with the strong inclination to evil which dwells in his mind. But this struggle is very far below that which the apostle here describes. The true nature of this conflict seems to be ascertained beyond dispute, by the parallel passage in Gal. 5: 17, already referred to. It cannot be denied, that to possess the Spirit is, in scriptural language, a characteristic mark of a true Christian. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Rom. 8: 9. Those, therefore, who have that Spirit, are Christians. This being the case, it will not be doubted that the passage in Galatians, in which the spirit is represented as warring against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit, is descriptive of the experience of the true believer. But the conflict there described is identical with that of which the same apostle speaks in this chapter. This is evident, not merely from the fact that one of the antagonist principles is, in both cases, called *flesh*, but because the description is nearly in the same words. In consequence of the opposition of the flesh and spirit, Paul tells the Galatians they cannot do the things that they would; and he says here of himself, that in consequence of the opposition between the flesh and the law of his mind, what he would he did not. The same conflict and the same bondage are described in each case; if the one be descriptive of the exercises of a true Christian, the other must be so also.

We recommend to special notice our author's exposition of the 5th and 7th chapters throughout. The aim of the Apostle is very happily kept in view. This is indispensable to a right understanding of the subject of which he treats.

We have already intimated our impression, that Professor H. is not equally happy in apprehending and presenting the apostle's idea in every place. To give an instance of a less happy exposition, we refer to ver. 2 of Chap. viii. *For the law of the spirit of life, &c.*

He notices three interpretations distinguished by various shades of meaning, by Calvin, Beza and Witsius; and of these, gives preference to the third, that of Witsius. The gospel, whose author is the life-giving Spirit, is the idea which he selects as that of the text. We do think the interpretation either of Calvin or of Beza, or that of Guyse, in his critical note on this verse, preferable to this; but especially the view of Beza appears to be sustained by the

chain of the apostle's reasoning, and by the import of the terms. Philology and logic unite in its favour. Professor H. is a known advocate of the existence of a *principle of grace* or of *spiritual rectitude* in the soul of the believer, distinct from action, and the more immediate spring of holy activity. This text, we are persuaded, furnishes a very direct proof of that truth. It is admitted, that this application of the term law, is in correspondence with apostolic use; but he supposes it not to harmonize with the context in this passage. His reasons do not appear to us valid, and their invalidity rises chiefly from a slight misapprehension of the apostle's process of thought. The fact is, that the truth in ver. 2 is not, as Professor H. supposes, adduced in support of the assertion in the former clause of ver. 1. *There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*; but it is intended to connect with the latter part of that verse, in order to show the *principle* whence proceeds the believer's *walk*, which is "not after the flesh but after the spirit."

The second reason against the interpretation we prefer, is not well founded, however true in itself the doctrine which the Professor purposes to guard. The believer, indeed, is not, while in this life, made perfect in holiness; and yet he is freed from the *dominion* of sin. *Thus he that is born of God sinneth not*, as he once did. There is a high and very important sense, in which the penitent believer is made free from the law of sin and of death, though not absolutely exempted from the influence of that *principle* of indwelling depravity. The third reason against Beza's interpretation, being expressed with some history, requires no remark, and the weight of the other two are removed by a more consistent view of the context.

The first part of ver. 1st finds its reason or foundation in the statement of ver. 3d., and not in the assertion of ver. 2d. The *sacrificial offering* of the Son of God in our nature is the ground, or procuring cause, of our justification, *περι ἁμαρτίας*, *on account of his sacrifice for sin*, God condemned sin. The construction is the same as that in Luke xix. 37. *περι πασων—ὑναμεων*, *for all i. e. on account of all the mighty works, &c.* This is Professor H's own interpretation of ver. 3d. It is worthy of notice that the apostle's reference, in this place, to justification is only incidental. He had disposed of that doctrine before he entered upon the sixth chapter; in that and the seventh chapter, he

discusses, as is shown in this volume, in a very satisfactory manner, the subject of sanctification. In those chapters, however, Paul did not finish this discussion; but carries it into chapter viii., and with great power and by a gradation of great beauty conducts us through the privileges, exercises, and trials of the sanctified believer, to a contemplation of his glorified state. A form of caution, not justified by this passage, against *Arminianism*, seems to have led our author, as it had done some distinguished and sound men before him, to overlook the prominence which sanctification continues to have in these verses. The following remarks will aid in presenting what is now considered as the apostle's plan.

1. The believer, engaged in the christian warfare, is the subject of the latter portion of Chap. vii. Holiness is so far predominant as to give him a commanding, though not a perfect, character, for rectitude of heart and life. His character is one of mingled attributes and aspect. Light and darkness, order and confusion are found there. From this view of the character, the inquiry, whether by an objector or the partially instructed, might very naturally be—"What is the *legal state* of this man before God? Does it correspond with his imperfect character? Is he but partially justified? Must he, so far as he is sanctified, be justified, and so far as he is found defective in holiness, be condemned"? The answer to these perplexing queries is found in the assertion, ver. 1. *There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.* Their justification is complete. That justification, in no degree, rests upon their sanctification; but exclusively upon their interest in the righteousness of their Redeemer, in virtue of union with him.

2. The evidence of this union with the Saviour and consequent interest in his righteousness, is found in their holiness of life. They walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

3. This course of life is more than an external form. It has its immediate spring in a *principle of spiritual vitality*, supernaturally incorporated with the faculties of the renovated soul, lying deeper, we think, than their disposition, toward what is holy, for it gives that disposition. This spiritual vitality, this operative principle of godliness, is a *law* of the constitution of the new man, implanted within him by

the life-giving Spirit of God; it quickens him to a divine life and hence its denomination, *the law of the spirit of life*—that is, the principle of spiritual life. The operation of this law gives character to the believer's *walk*; and, at the same time, evinces his relation to Jesus Christ, and his consequent exemption from condemnation.

With those who speak of this principle under the names of *habit*, *disposition*, or *permanent tendency* under the influence of the Spirit of God, we will have no controversy. We, nevertheless, are inclined to the idea of an effect of grace, intermediate between the agency of the Spirit of God and that tendency of the mind which is toward spirituality of action, and which gives to the mind that tendency. This involves the idea of *ability* corresponding with the nature of the moral or spiritual action required by the moral or spiritual law, and performed by the spiritual man. Dependence upon the efficiency of God is disputable, and so is the indistinct agency of God and man. The agency of the renovated soul, as well as that which belongs to the natural man, must be considered in its whole character, as distinct from the agency of the divine Being. For this peculiar action of the renewed man, there is, in his renovated constitution, an adequate cause beyond the impulse of motives—something to which the motives are adapted, and which is fitted to respond to them.

4. The meritorious cause of all this is brought into view, in ver. 3d. The obedience unto death of the Lord Jesus. *Through the sin offering* presented by the Son of God in our nature, the sentence of condemnation was executed upon sin; pardon directly secured, and that, in its train of blessings, brings the influences of grace for sanctification. The satisfaction of the Redeemer does not more certainly procure forgiveness, acceptance, and eternal life, than it secures holiness of heart and life. See Tit. ii. 14. To both justification and sanctification, as secured by the obedience unto death of the Saviour, the apostle's eye is directed; but justification as before remarked, being incidentally introduced, rather than directly discussed, the bearing upon it of the reference to the offering for sin, is of the same character, while the main subject of discussion,—progressive holiness,—is kept chiefly in view; and hence, while it is true that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, it is equally true, that the righteousness of the law, in virtue of the

sin offering of our Lord, should have a fulfilment in the evangelical obedience of the justified believer, rendered in obedience to the law as a rule of life presented to us in the hand of the Mediator. This, it is believed, the context requires us to consider as chiefly intended, in this Scripture. That these remarks do not, in doctrine, clash with the principles of Professor H., will be obvious to every reader. All the doctrines here involved are, by this commentator and ourselves, viewed substantially in the same light, as Bible truths. The *exegesis* of this passage is the only point in question.

Reference may be likewise made to another part of the viii. Chapter, as furnishing another instance of oversight in this excellent commentary. It is found in pp. 335, 336.—In the passage which verses 19—23 embrace, Paul himself appears to be transported, by the grandeur of his subject, beyond the usual boundaries of even inspiration itself. In this instance, the poetic *afflatus* is in combination with the didactic. The commentator is not insensible to the magnificence of his subject, and his comment, in general, recommends itself to the inquiring student. The exposition of ver. 20 is less distinct and more unsatisfactory, than most other parts of the work.

The argument of Professor H., in settling the import of the word *κτίσις* in this text, is very much to our mind. The 20th verse is a parenthesis in Paul's usual manner. In matter, the 19th and 21st verses connect, directly with each other. The inferior orders of creation are represented, by a bold but frequent figure of speech, as earnestly desiring and expecting the day of the revelation of the glory of the sons of God. This gives occasion to refer to, and account for, the present degradation of those lower orders of nature, together with their subjection to vain and criminal abuses. *The creature was made subject to vanity*,—to suffering and the perverse abuse of sinful man; *not willingly*,—it is not in accordance either with its nature or original end, thus to suffer and be made the instrument of sin; *but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope*. He, who has thus subjected the creature, is not God, but man, by his first transgression and subsequent abuse; *by reason of him—on account of himself*, to gratify his unregulated propensities, in making himself his chief end; *in hope*, in the vain expectation of gratification and enjoyment from the crea-

ture, rather than from the Creator. The interpretation is surely very forced, which connects hope with the creature. The creature *in hope* was made subject to vanity! It is still worse to connect it with God. The divine Being hoping! We are not unfrequently shocked with the anthropomorphic language so often and so inappropriately applied, in our country, to the Deity. "The feelings of God" is a phrase, that grates upon something deeper than our ears. The Son of God assumed our nature before he could feel, and that he might be capable of sympathizing with us. Professor H., however, let it be noted, does not favour the idea of ascribing *hope* to God, though he does ascribe to him, we think unhappily, the subjection of the creature to vanity. But it is not our purpose to enter into critical details. Both time and room forbid us to do so. The attentive reader will perceive, that the "expectation" of ver. 19th finds its reason in ver. 21st. *Because, &c. ἵνα, since the creature shall be delivered, &c.* Should the words, *in hope* be connected with ver. 21 the idea will not be materially changed. *The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth—in hope, since the creature, &c. &c.* Logical analysis, however, favours the view we have taken of its relation to ver. 20.

The exposition of the often ill explained ninth chapter, is very satisfactory. Prof. H. keeps at a due distance from the revolting views of the *supralapsarian* school, and guards, with decision, against the interpretation which imposes upon the passage a diluted sense, unworthy, not only of the inspired Paul, but also of rational natural theology. God is supreme, man is a voluntary being; the salvation of any sinner is a matter of grace; the abandonment of the transgressor to the tendencies of his evil heart, and the results of those tendencies, is an act of righteous retribution, for which the Sovereign Lord of the universe may not be called to account. Every favour enjoyed by the sinner is of grace; every part of his punishment is the wages of sin.

Chapter xiii. brings into view the Christian doctrine of civil government. The circumstances of the church at that period, demanded a statement of those principles which are fundamental to political association, the subject being one very intimately connected, both with the safety and happiness of man, and with the glory of God, the Sove-

reign Ruler of the world. Occasion was furnished, by existing circumstances, for laying down those first principles of political science, by apostolical authority, which would constitute a satisfactory rule of conduct to the several departments of the body politic, in every land, in subsequent times, as well as at that day. To the too rigid application of the letter of the judicial law of the Israelitish commonwealth, the Christianized Jews were doubtless generally inclined; and that the believing Gentiles, now turned from idols to the living God, should look upon the authority which was lodged in the hands of the votaries of Jove, Venus, and their associated rabble of heathen deities, with doubts of its legitimacy, is not unreasonable to suppose. They saw the Capitol and the Pantheon in close neighbourhood, and as they had abjured the worship of the one, it was not unreasonable to inquire what fealty they owed to the other.

The Apostle, in meeting this condition of things, pursued a course worthy of his own great mind, and of that inspiration by which he was directed. Often has the narrow minded spirit of partyism presumed to wonder, how Paul could dispose of a subject so practical and so exciting as this, in terms so general. He furnishes no weapon, which either the tyrant or the restless factionist can employ, to subserve his purpose. Paul enters into no minute details for the gratification of curious speculation, nor does he encourage the scruples of a morbid state of conscience. He lays down general principles, easily apprehended, and leaves them to work their own way, and produce their legitimate effects. To the neglect of any duty, or to the invasion of any claim of God, or right of man, he gives no countenance; nor does he employ an expression that can be fairly brought to encourage schemes calculated to shock or convulse society; while every principle of his code, and every maxim of his instructions, is calculated to improve the order of the social state, and to purify its character. Our own age and country, require the political principles of the Apostle to be distinctly brought into view. The tottering thrones of despotism, and the mouldering altars of superstition, which, in the meridian of their alliance, so extensively and deeply effected the debasement of man, have still a few votaries. The infidelity of radicalism is in violent effort to blot out from civil society, all sense of obligation to God,—all feel-

ing of social dependence upon, and of responsibility to him, in the conducting of public affairs. It becomes the friend of moral order,—the Christian and the patriot,—to guard the foundations of the fabric. The authorized expounders of the moral law of God, ought to be qualified to indicate, with clearness, the application of its principles to the moral condition of the state. But let them stand aloof from the mere party brawls of the busy politician; and let them, ere they open their lips upon the subject, see to it, that they understand it well. We know not how this can more effectually be done, than by a profound study of the doctrine of the Apostle of the Gentiles, as stated in the passage before us; and then, by causing it to be understood, felt, and applied by the people at large. A brief analysis of the first verses of this chapter will set the whole matter in a clear point of view.

1. An orderly subjection,—*ὑποτασσέσθω*—is enjoined upon every member of the commonwealth. 2. This subjection is to *authority*—*ἐξουσία*—*legitimate powers*, not usurpers, not tyrants. From the term rendered *higher*, considered in its “concrete” import, we are not inclined to exclude the idea of moral excellence. *Ἱερωσύνη* is an epithet familiar to Paul, and by him is employed in connexions which involve moral worth. The character of fellow-Christians, the knowledge of Christ, and the peace of God, exemplify this remark. (See Phil. 2: 3, and 3: 8, and 4: 7.) And when describing an institution of God for the good of man, we can find no good reason for limiting the import of the term to mere political elevation, irrespective of moral character. 3. A reason for this subjection to *authority*, and one of sufficient weight, is immediately added: There is no *authority*, *ἐξουσία*, *except it be of God*. It is well known there are two very different descriptions of power; the one moral, the other immoral. The latter is of God by *permission* only, and is disapproved of him; the former is of God by appointment, and has his approbation; this is authority. It is of this the text speaks; it is legitimate; it is the ordinance of God—appointed by him, and to which he requires our *conscientious* subjection. 4. An additional reason for subjection is found in the end of the magistracy: It is for good to man; the functionary invested with it, is *the minister of God to thee for good, a terror to evil works, he bears not the sword*—the symbol of power—in vain; he is a praise

to those who do well. Thus in a few inspired words, we have the duty of the citizen, *subjection*; the *authority* to which subjection is required, the higher powers; the *source* of that authority, the appointment of God; the *end* of its appointment and existence, the good of the citizens; and the *character* of the authority which has legitimate claims upon the support of the citizens, a terrour to evil works, and a praise to those who do good.

We are not certain that we rightly apprehend the meaning of the commentator in the following declarations: "Every person who is, in point of fact, clothed with authority, is to be regarded as having a claim to obedience, founded on the will of God." p. 522.—"Those who are in authority are to be obeyed within their sphere, no matter *how*, or *by whom* appointed. It was to Paul a matter of little importance whether the Roman Emperor was appointed by the senate, the army, or the people; whether the assumption of the imperial authority by Cæsar was just or unjust, or whether his successors had a legitimate claim to the throne or not." (p. 523.)

Prof. H. is, in politics, neither a modern radical, nor an advocate of the exploded passive obedience and non-resistance of former times. We do not understand him as affirming that, had the Roman government been at all in the eye of the Apostle, it would then have been a matter of indifference to him whether it was a legitimate authority or an immoral power; whether it was a tyranny or an institution which answered to the moral ordinance of God. He has, in the exposition, and in the statement of doctrines, guarded against such a conclusion. It will be readily admitted, that if, as Prof. H. supposes, (and in this he is no doubt correct,) the Apostle's aim was to lay down the fundamental principles of the doctrine of civil government—irrespective of the form or character of any existing power, then indeed, so far as that was concerned, it was of no consequence to him what was the spirit or form of the Roman government, or of that of any other state. The assertion, however, is not happy that, "Those who are in authority, are to be obeyed within their sphere, no matter *how*, or *by whom* appointed." All who attach importance to free constitutional frames of social order, without more explanation than is given, will be slow to subscribe to the assertion.

Indeed it does not appear altogether in keeping with the other parts of this commentary.

The subject is one of great importance, and should be treated with correspondent precision. Infidels urge that the affairs of states and religion should be altogether unconnected. Fanatics plead that no authority can be legitimate unless it explicitly own subjection to the religion of Immanuel. These extremes are equally distant from the truth. Prof. H., if we rightly apprehend his views, is liable to be misunderstood in this place, and his pages to be pressed into a service, he wishes not. To escape this undesirable result, perhaps, either less or more should have been said upon the subject.

The profane alliances between church and state, which so extensively corrupted both in the nations of the old world, and which have been so prolific in persecutions of harmless opinion and innocent practice, as well as in the repression of free and enlightened discussion, are objects of just and intense abhorrence. But surely between the persecutions dictated by the spirit of bigotry or by that of a ghostly ambition, and the licentiousness of an infidel philosophy, there is a way of safety, in which nations may travel, in order to obtain the ends of the social state. Man is a moral being, and, in his constitution, the foundations of the religious character are deeply laid. The principles which enter into his constitution, he carries along with him into every relation of life. National society, as a moral person, is the creature of God, and as such, is an appropriate subject of his law.—Magistracy is the moral ordinance of God as the moral Governour of the world; and upon the subject of social morality as well as of that which is personal, the Bible, in whatever land it obtains a place, distinctly gives instruction. To escape from the imputations justly cast upon the meddling ecclesiastic, who, by mingling in the mere party strife of the politician, dishonours his high and sacred vocation, there is no need that the enlightened and consistent minister of religion should yield to the infidel his impertinent claims, by not giving that prominence to a broad exposition of social morality which his text book—the Bible, authorizes, and which the importance of the subject to man, as a citizen and a christian, imperatively demands. Is it too much to say?—Upon this subject, on the part of the christian ministry, there must be more high intelligence and less ignoble

shrinking. A moral institution, originating from God as the moral governour of the world, having man, a moral being, for its immediate subject, the principles of the moral law of God for its rule, in guarding the person, life, property, and rights of man, civil and religious; and yet neither religion nor morality, as such, within the sphere of its authority! The statesman and the jurist maintain that religion and morality must be laid at the foundation of the social state; and to defend the foundation of the state, we are disposed to think, is within the legitimate sphere of government, as the efficient organ of the commonwealth.—Were it so that morality and religion should be, in no sense, within the legitimate sphere of government would it be an unwarrantable assumption, that “civil functionaries, as such, are under no obligation to know what is the law of God?” We know the position, to some extent, has obtained currency, and within the period of our own memory, the experiment was tried, to establish a government irrespective of religion. What was the result? The darkest hour in the history of France, and the bloodiest page which records the transactions of that dark hour, furnish a reply to this inquiry. That an institution appointed of God, founded in the nature, relations, and condition of man, has, under certain aspects, both religion and morality within its appropriate sphere, is a position which ought to be universally understood, and emphatically affirmed. The right application of the principle of this position may, like all other important principles, require discretion; but of such application, we are well assured it is capable, and that in perfect consistency with entire exemption from all vicious connexion of Church and State, and with the protection of all freedom of opinion, discussion, and practice, on this side the regions of licentiousness. In a land enjoying the advantages of supernatural revelation, we do not hesitate to affirm, that the people, illuminated by that light, are morally obliged to instruct the constituted authorities of such land, as their representatives, to honour the God of heaven by the distinct recognition of the existence of his peculiar empire, and by the protection of all the rights of that empire. The recognition of the existence of the church of Jesus Christ as a divine corporation, and as having external rights to be protected, involves no encroachment upon any natural right of man, nor can it either justify, or lead to any act of

political oppression. Man has religious as well as civil rights, and they are in perfect harmony with each other. In dismissing the subject, we beg leave to say, that in the remarks now made, no imputation, even by implication, is intended against Professor H.'s views of public morality. Between his principles and our own, if we rightly interpret his pages, there is no discrepancy; but we again say, we think, in some of his assertions, he is liable to be misapprehended.

The x.v. chapter brings into view the principles according to which, the fellowship of the church, or which is the same thing, the communion of saints, should be regulated. Upon the exposition we have no remark, except that of approbation, to offer. He presents the ideas of his text, with his general perspicuity of manner and candour of sentiment. We have only to regret that Professor H., induced by the importance of the subject and the perception of its bearing upon the actual condition of the church at large, did not, in a well digested exercitation—something in the shape of what is done at the end of chapter vii., give us a more extended developement of the principles laid down by the apostle.

The unity of the Church of God, as set forth in the sacred Scriptures, and there urged upon our attention in so many forms, as an actual existence we have never known. In our own, and in our fathers' days, few objects have been more prominent, or agents more active, than has been the spirit of schism. To the consequent state of faction, we have been so habituated as scarcely to feel it to be an evil. Not a few, perhaps, could deem an opposite condition of affairs undesirable. The spirit that influenced, on this subject, the Apostles of the Lamb, apostolic men, and the more prominent agents in the Protestant reformation, alas! is rarely felt in modern days. Calvin, we have heard some professed Calvinists say, did not understand the principles and the application of the principles of Church fellowship. Against the genius of Apostolic authority, no less opposition appears, though its form of expression may be somewhat modified. This is not the place, nor is it our intention, to enter into a developement of the primitive causes of the divisions of Zion, nor into an enumeration of those effects which, in their turn, themselves become unnamed and undesigned causes of uncalculated and incalculable power, in prolonging, extending, and giving intensity

to the spirit of schism. It is, too, beside our purpose to notice in detail, the ill advised, though well meant, measures to heal the wounds inflicted in the strifes of faction, upon the expectants of immortality. Such developements and details, though we are not so rash as to expect from them the healing of the maladies of which complaint is made, may, nevertheless be, in their proper place, a step in the process preparatory to the effectual application of the healing balm. The time for this application has not yet come. Faction has not yet finished its evil work. It must go forward until even its votaries, in whom any trace of moral goodness may remain, shall be weary of the violence, and urge a release from their unprofitable, as well as dishonourable drudgery.

While, then, we do not advise those who see, and feel, and weep over those worse than follies, and their effects, to lay aside their mourning weeds, we do say to them, "sorrow not as those who have no hope." Other and better agencies are in active operation. These are giving direction to an undercurrent of great efficiency, whose influence will, in due time, be felt and seen. Let none imagine, as a cure for existing evils, the amalgamation into one body of the mistakes, prejudices, selfishness, and the spirit of faction found in the respective ranks of parties now upon the field. The Redeemer and Lord of Zion has, doubtless, settled and marked by his own authority, a safe and ample ground on which all his redeemed, believing, and penitent disciples can meet in visible, as well as invisible fellowship. May we not hope, that after inquiring men shall have thought, prayed, written, and consulted upon the subject, God will raise up, among the sons of Zion, some mind of commanding power to gather the scattered rays of light, and direct them to bear upon it with such splendour of evidence, as to leave in the breast of every right hearted man, no place for doubt, as to what God requires of him, and what he himself ought to do?

At present, the general commonwealth of the Israel of God exhibits a remarkable aspect of her condition: old foundations of faction have been shaken, and yet the spirit of schism is in active operation. Let the upright in heart, who have been unhappily carried into this current, pause, ere they reach the dangerous falls below. To all, we have sometimes thought, the following somewhat complex, yet

easily apprehended rule might be of use, if consistently and perseveringly applied: Ascertain with precision the principles which entered into the constitution of the Apostolic Church, and the relative position of those principles, as terms of ecclesiastical fellowship, and as subjects of instruction, for the initiated who occupy, in the school of the great Prophet of the covenant, their respective forms; in the light of inspired prophecy and promise, then look forward and understand what shall be the practical application of those principles in the millennial age; these points being settled, let each department of the divided Zion, speedily endeavour an approximation to that standard. Thus, instead of doubtful disputations, the parties may extend to each other a helping hand, and in place of retarding, will mutually further their progress, and ere they be aware, with delightful surprise, find themselves upon the summit of that mountain, whose *whole limit round about shall be most holy*, occupying a common ground, in possession of the same faith, the same baptism, the same spirit, and the same hope; for they shall have, and confess the same Lord. Then shall Jerusalem, the city of our solemnities, be a *quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down*.

Other places of this valuable work, which had been noted for remark, are passed over by us. It will appear to the reader, that whilst we attribute to this production of Prof. H. great excellence, we, nevertheless, consider it as capable of being improved. To this, the learned author will, no doubt in his hours of leisure, pay due attention, while its spirit of firmness, liberality, and kindness, will in no degree be impaired. It is trusted the abridgement which is noticed in the public papers, but which we have not yet seen, however well adapted to the class of persons for whom it is designed, will in no respect supplant the original work. We cannot anticipate a compend that will embrace the learning, reasoning, and consequent illustration of the larger volume; and these the student cannot spare.

ART. VI. ANCIENT LIMITS OF THE NEGRO RACE.

By CYRUS HAMLIN, Student of Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.

Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and trade of the Ancient Nations of Africa. By A. H. L. Reeren. Translated from the German. Oxford, 2 vols. 8 vo. 1832.

BOTH Nature and Divine Providence seem to have designed Africa for a laboratory of hidden mysteries. The Christian, viewing there the dark workings of Providence, looks up with the eye of faith for an explanation of facts upon which reason hardly gives him a satisfactory theory. He sees some of the fairest regions of the earth for three thousand years, stained with blood and unrevenged wrongs—overhung with gloom and every form of human woe and human guilt. To the philosopher, Africa presents some of the most interesting and difficult problems for his solution. The influence of every variety of climate and geographical location upon the human race may there be studied, together with all those causes which retard or facilitate the development of society. Although we are accurately acquainted with only a small part of this continent, yet its history causes to pass before us every light and shade of civil and social and religious life, from the lowest depths of ignorance, barbarism, simplicity and superstition, to the highest grade of ancient political power, refinement and religious faith. All the rest of the world, through all periods of its history, cannot present such a panorama as Africa. Her vast and awful deserts of sand, her luxuriant coasts, the rich vallies upon her widely distant rivers, her beautiful oases in the midst of solitary wastes, strange and huge beasts and stranger vegetation, her mighty kingdoms and cities whose light glimmers forth from the mist of antiquity—Ethiopia, Meroe, Egypt, Carthage, and hundred-gated Thebes—her philosophy and religion flowing through the classical channels of Greece and Rome and immortalised by the masters of reason and of song,—her representatives of man in the negro, the Ethiopian, the Egyptian, the Carthaginian, and in the nomadel tribes and troglodytes, with their amending variety of advancement and degradation,—present a scene, the elements of which cannot elsewhere be found.

Upon some points of this scene, which have long laid in obscurity, Professor Heeren has thrown a clear and steady light. His researches have been very freely appropriated by every recent writer upon the ancient affairs of Nubia, Abyssinia, Egypt, and the Barbary States. Slightly change his language and transpose a little the order of subjects, and you have a fac simile of most that has been published upon the same points for the last ten years, excepting of course the researches of travellers.

When it is remembered that his researches extend back from two to three thousand years, it may at first create a doubt whether, on such subjects, they can arrive at satisfactory conclusions or claim a character higher than mere conjectures. This feeling however will vanish in proportion to the carefulness with which the work is studied.—There are three chief sources from which its materials are drawn; monumental records, ancient historians, and modern travellers. In some parts of Africa, chiefly upon the Nile, both above and below the cataracts, the monumental records are numerous and distinct. Aside from the hieroglyphic writings, some historical reliefs, skilfully sculptured in the solid rock of monuments, temples, and grotto-tombs, preserve for us a series of very important facts, and from their obscure recesses shed light upon events which for two thousand years have been unknown or unexplained. It is a singular circumstance, and one which casts solemn decision upon the ambitious struggles of human life, that in the mightiest nations of antiquity, the abodes of the living have all crumbled to dust, and the abodes of the dead and the temples of dumb idols alone remain to keep the silent record of their pride and power.

Of the ancient historians, Herodotus, the father of history, is supposed to have visited Africa in the most prosperous period of the Carthaginian empire, 450 or 460 B. C. He recorded in his celebrated work the results of his own observations during his residence in Egypt, and of his inquiries of the caravan merchants, who visited the "Land of Dates" on the north, and the negro countries in the west of Africa. Strabo and Diodorus Siculus also travelled in Africa, the former of whom visited the Cataracts of the Nile. A careful comparison of these writers with many others, both Greek and Roman, in the work before us, has thrown much light upon obscure topics of African history.

The investigations of modern travellers are of more value in researches into the ancient condition of Africa, than may at first be supposed. The geographical character of the countries, and the habits of the people have, in many instances, undergone but slight changes.* The caravan rout described by Herodotus in the fourth book (Chap. 181—185) of his history has been identified with the modern routes by Horneman, Browne, Lyon, Caillaud, and other travellers. The articles of traffic are the same, the natural productions are the same, and the Land of Dates and the negro countries are visited for the same purposes as they were two and three thousand years ago. The above named travellers, together with Mungo Park, Buckhardt, Denon, the splendid work and drawings of Gau, and the Journals of Denham, Clapperton, Caillie, and other recent explorers, furnish subjects for very interesting comparisons with ancient history.

It is our design, however, to present the results of Heeren's investigations and the observations of travellers little farther than as they relate to the question—*What races of men have inhabited Africa? or more particularly, what were the ancient limits of the Negro race?* From our familiar and unfortunate acquaintance with the Negro, it has become a popular impression, that he constitutes peculiarly *the African race*, and inhabits the larger part of the African continent—an impression both erroneous and unjust.

An examination of Ancient Africa naturally divides itself into three parts—the Carthaginian territory on the north, the Egyptian on the north and east, and the Ethiopian in the central and western regions.

North Africa had various designations and divisions among ancient writers, drawn from some local peculiarity. The region bordering upon the Mediterranean was called "habitable Africa," embracing the northern parts of Morocco, Fez, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. Its fine climate, rich and fruitful soil, and facilities for commerce, make it well worthy of the name. The next region was termed "wild-beast Lybia," and reached nearly to the borders of the great Desert, where roamed the nomad tribes. The fruitful regions invited to agriculture and commerce, and the southern to the caravan trade across the deserts into the

* Heeren, vol. 1. pp. 193, 196, 224, 320, 176.

interior, from whence were brought black slaves, and gold, and precious stones.

The Carthaginian empire assumed the precise form and character which these circumstances would naturally suggest. The Mediterranean coast was lined with colonies from Syrtis Major (modern Gulf of Sidra) to the Pillars of Hercules, and the power of Carthage extended southward, to the sandy solitudes. Her foreign possessions were, Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily in part, the Balears, and other small islands in the Mediterranean, and colonial settlements in Spain.

There was no port, nor city, nor fruitful land where she did not, in some way or other, establish a mercantile interest. Her commerce whitened the Mediterranean, and spread its fearless sails in seas unvisited by the ships of other nations. Her agriculture clothed her hills and vallies with fruitfulness and luxuriance, while caravans from her nomad tribes, crossed the burning desert, where everlasting death-silence reigns over the dreary wastes, and brought from central regions, for her foreign marts, gems and gold, and slaves.

This animated scene of political life, and national enterprise, however, was not called into existence by the original inhabitants of Africa. It was the result of colonization. Carthage was founded, according to the usual chronology, about 878, B.C., by a Phœnician colony from Tyre—the city whose “wise men were pilots,” whose king was “full of wisdom and perfect beauty,” and whose self-appropriated title was, “The Goddess of the Seas.”* Utica, Leptis, Hippo, Adrumetum and other smaller cities, were likewise founded upon the coast of Africa, by the Phœnicians. Until after the fall of Carthage, they always maintained the ascendancy in northern Africa. Proofs of this are very fully presented in Bochart, and incidentally in the second volume of Heeren’s Asiatic Researches.† It is also the incidental or direct testimony of Herodotus, Polybius and Scylax; and indeed all the ancient historians either affirm or assume this fact, in their notices of Africa. Herodotus gives, as a reason, why Cambyses could not induce the Phœnicians to aid him in his designs against the Carthaginians; that “they had bound themselves by

* Ezekiel, 26, 27, 28, chapters.

† See article Phœnicians.

solemn oaths not to do such things as to make war upon their own children.*

Carthage reciprocated the affection of the mother country. When Tyre was besieged and taken by Alexander, she offered a refuge for the Tyrian merchants with their families and treasures. Diodorus, II. p. 190. The commercial treaties, also, which were naturally formed between Rome, Carthage, Utica, and Tyre, and which are preserved by Polybius (Lib. I. p. 437,) prove, beyond question, the complete predominance of the Phœnicians in the northern part of Africa. They were the war-making, treaty-making, and legislative power.

The knowledge of this fact will, probably, detract much from the interest with which some portions of the *Æneid* have been perused, by certain persons, while under the impression that its characters were drawn from the Negro race. The charms of the beautiful Dido, which so fascinated the heart of "pius Æneas," that the gods alone were able to rescue him, could have hardly consisted in the glossy jet of her complexion, her woolly hair, thick lips, and short corpulent frame. The graceful form of the Phœnician queen would, perchance, turn as proudly away from some of the compliments, which the taste of these admirers has paid her, as she did from the visits of her mundane lord in the realms of Pluto.

The aboriginal inhabitants of the Carthaginian territories in Africa, were composed of various tribes, whose peculiarities are described by Herodotus, with considerable minuteness.† Their persons were tall and well formed; and the habit of wearing tufts of long hair, dressed in different ways, to designate the different tribes, proves them not to have been of the Negro race.

Herodotus says expressly, that the aboriginal inhabitants of northern Africa, were a different race from the Ethiopians, and comprises them under the name of Libyans.‡

We find, among them all, no traces of the Negro race, which is mentioned only in connexion with slavery or the slave trade. The personal descriptions go to identify them with the Berber race, which is spread over a large part of northern and eastern Africa, and to sustain the conclusions

* Herod. Lib. III. 19.

† Lib. IV. cap. 168-181.

‡ IV. 197.

of Lawrence and Blumenbach, that they were a variety of the Caucasian family.* Remnants of these aboriginal inhabitants, are still to be found in the mountainous regions, which stretch from Mt. Atlas, nearly across Africa. They speak a language bearing no resemblance to the Arabic spoken by the Moors, from whom they keep themselves distinct. All travellers are unanimous in pronouncing it purely African. The incursions of the Vandals and Arabs, have pressed them back towards the south, on the borders of the Negro countries, where they still maintain their distinctive characteristics. They have, according to the description of various travellers, good features, sparkling eyes, projecting brows, sharp noses, thin lips, beard and hair thin, and a cheerful physiognomy.† In these particulars, Park, Burckhardt, Denham, and Clapperton, and Caillié agree.

The question has often been asked: To what nation did the Christian Bishops of Carthage, Hippo, and of Alexandria in Egypt, belong? Some have considered them of Negro origin, others of European. There is no evidence that the Negro race ever inhabited the north of Africa, except as the slave trade carried them thither, and then they were usually transported to other markets. After the fall of Carthage, Africa received numerous accessions of Greeks and Romans, in the principal commercial cities, and this, probably, led to the early introduction of Christianity. The natural inference therefore is, that the learned men were Greeks or Romans. They might have been of Phœnician or Libyan descent, but we have no means of determining that this was the fact.

There is another point of more importance, and of too much interest, as a historical precedent, at the present time, to be passed unnoticed—the influence of the Phœnician colonies upon the original inhabitants. Although Carthage directed her attention principally to commerce, yet she well knew that commerce could not flourish long without agriculture. With this conviction, she succeeded in bringing the native inhabitants of the most fertile regions, into the love of an agricultural life.‡ Indeed next to arms, agriculture

* Lawrence's *Physiology*, page 465, and note.

† Conder's *Geographical Dictionary*. London, 1834. Article, *Beiber*.

‡ Heeren, Vol. I. see whole of chapter I.

was considered as the most honourable employment. Mago and Hamilcar, two distinguished Carthaginian generals, were both authors of works on husbandry. That of Mago was in twenty-eight books, embracing all departments of husbandry—the rearing of cattle, the cultivation of the vine, of fruit trees, and of grain, and the adaptation of these to particular soils and climates. It is frequently referred to by Varro, Columella, and Pliny, and shows that agriculture was deemed not unworthy of attention by the nobility.

Scylax, as quoted by Heeren, describes the country around the lesser Syrtis, and Triton Lake, as magnificently fruitful, abounding in tall fine cattle, and its inhabitants as distinguished for wealth and beauty. Another region, according to Strabo, between two and three hundred miles in length, extending southward from Cape Bon, and one hundred and fifty in width, was also distinguished for its fertility and high cultivation.* It embraced the most flourishing seaports, and was crowded with agricultural settlements. The natives gradually intermingled with the colonists, and formed the strength of the Carthaginian state. The surprising effect of this admirable policy has been noticed by most of the ancient historians. Herodotus affirms, that beyond the dominions of the Carthaginian empire, no people could be found with settled habitations, engaged in agricultural pursuits, intending, of course, to confine the remark to that part of Africa. Within her dominions, he describes some powerful tribes,—the Maxyes, the Zauces, and Gyzantes—as engaged in the peaceful occupations of the field. Aristotle is quoted, commenting upon the same policy, in his “*Treatise de politia Carthaginiensium*.”† “It is in this way,” he remarks, (that is, by agricultural settlements,) “Carthage preserves the love of her people. She sends out, continually, colonies composed of her citizens, into the districts around her, and by that means, makes them men of property. It is a proof,” he adds, “of a mild intelligent government, that it assists the poor by accustoming them to labour.” Cicero attributes the fall of Carthage to the abandonment of this policy—to the neglecting of agricultural interests, from a blind zeal in

* Heeren, Vol. 1. page 57.

† Heeren, Vol. 1. page 40.

commerce and navigation.* Facts like these, from the ancient history of colonization, should "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men," and the prejudices of some good men in regard to the ultimate success of modern colonies in Africa.

We must pass from this brief view of the inhabitants of Carthage to Ethiopia. A simple collection of some of the most ancient notices of Ethiopia will show the rank which that people occupied in the remotest periods of history:—

"Towards the west lies Ethiopia, the most distant region of the earth. It abounds in gold and ivory, and ebony, and all kinds of trees, and its inhabitants are the most beautiful and long-lived of the human race." Herod, III. 114.

"Let the mighty men come forth, the Ethiopians, that handle the shield." Jer. 46 : 9.

"The opulence of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine." Isaiah, 45 : 14.

"But now the god remote, a heavenly guest,
In Ethiopia graced the genial feast,—
(A race divided, whom, with sloping rays,
The rising and descending sun surveys."⁶)

Odyss. Lib. I. 23.

"The sire of gods, and all the etherial train,
On the warm limits of the farthest main,
Now mix with mortals, nor disdain to grace,
The feasts of Ethiopias' blameless race."⁷—Iliad, Lib. I. 423.

The term *Ethiopia*, as used by ancient writers, comprised many different nations. "It would distract the mind," says Heeren, "to consider them as one nation, or even as one race." It is at least far from being true that they were all of the Negro race; and, indeed, it is doubtful whether this was the most numerous, as it certainly was not the most powerful, of the Ethiopic nations. We are aware, that an opposite impression is generally entertained; but it has resulted from the inaccuracy of ancient classification, rather than from any true historic foundation. The colour of the skin was once considered the only essential characteristic of the negro race; and all tribes of a very dark complexion were classed accordingly. Other charac-

* Nec vero ulla res magis labefactum diu et Carthaginem et Corinthum pervertit aliquando, quam hic error ac dissipatio civium, quod mercandi cupiditate et navigandi et agrorum et armorum cultum reliquerant. De Republica, Lib. II : IV.

teristics, however, are far more important than this: the greater size of the bones of the face, compared with those of the cranium; the depressed and retreating forehead; the protuberance of the alveoli and teeth; the form of the nose, being flat and broad; and the position of the foramen magnum occipitale, are all enumerated, by physiologists, as the essential criteria of the negro physiognomy. But, some tribes inhabit Africa of a complexion perfectly black, and yet their features are, in each particular, the very reverse of the above. Although by the Ethiopians, therefore, the dark-coloured races generally were intended, it does not follow that the negro race, in its restricted meaning, was designated.

The boundaries of the negro countries cannot be very accurately ascertained. They always occupied the western part of central Africa, and do not appear to have penetrated the great Desert, which forms their northern boundary. The Tuaricks and Tibboos, who are scattered over the country from Fez to Bornou, and southward to Timbuctoo* and the Senegal, are not negroes. A modern traveller, (Captain Lyon,) says that the former are the finest race of men he ever saw, tall, straight and handsome, with a certain air of independence and pride, which is very imposing. Their complexion is a brown, caused by the climate, and their language proves them to be of the Berber race. They are in perpetual war with the Soudan states, from whence they carry off negro slaves.

The Tibboos spread themselves over the country east of the great desert, and are of a roving disposition. Their complexion is of the brightest black, but without one of the Negro lineaments, having aquiline noses, and fine teeth and lips.*

The negro countries extended eastward into the central regions. Their boundary on the south is indefinite. They are considered by Malte Brun as reaching to Cape Negro, near the southern extremity of Congo or lower Guinea.† As there have been no causes to produce any general revolution among the inhabitants of this section of Africa, their condition in ancient times was, in all probability, similar to the present.

* Caillie's Travels to Timbuctoo, vol. 2, p. 65.

† Heeren, vol. 1. p. 303.

† Malte Brun, vol. 2. book 59, p. 421, and vol. 3d. book 59.

It is eastern Ethiopia, however, which is the object of the most interest in historical inquiries. It embraced the country above the cataracts of the Nile, as far as the northern part of the present Abyssinia, and is a land of monuments. The character of its inhabitants has, probably, been somewhat modified by amalgamation with Negroes introduced by the slave trade; but the original distinctions are still apparent. The aboriginal race is distinguished by a peculiar language, having no affinity with the Arabic, which is spoken by another class of the inhabitants, and by certain peculiarities of a physical nature. They are of a dark brown colour, with hair either naturally or artificially curled, but never woolly, and often braided into a pyramidal ornament upon the top of the head. "The men," says Burckhardt, "are generally well made, strong, and muscular, with fine features; in stature they are somewhat below the Egyptians; they have no mustachios, and but little beard, wearing it under the chin only, like the figures of the fugitives in the battle pieces, sculptured upon the walls of the Egyptian temples."* "The women," he adds "are all well made and, though not handsome, have generally sweet countenances, and very pleasing manners; I have even seen beauties among them." In all these particulars, the dress of the hair, the beard, and the outlines of the profile and form, they are clearly identified with the figures upon the monuments, and of course, with the ancient inhabitants. Another class lay claim to Arabian descent, and speak the Arabic language, and have all the peculiar traits of the Arab.

A very similar account of the inhabitants of Ethiopia is given by ancient writers. In the army of Xerxes, when he invaded Greece, says Herodotus, "*those above Egypt, the Arabians and Ethiopians*, constituted one division commanded by Arsames." Pliny also has a passage which he quotes from Juba, a Numidian king, asserting that the banks of the Nile from Philæ to Meroë were occupied by immigratory Arab tribes, different from the Ethiopians. Heeren, Conder, Lawrence, and many other distinguished physiologists and historians, regard the aboriginal class above described as belonging to the Berber or Caucasian race. There is no trace or lineament of the Negro physiognomy, either upon the ancient monuments, or in the descriptions of travellers.

* Burckhardt's Travels in Nubia, 2d edition p. 133.

None of the Ethiopic nations have an equal interest to the antiquarian, with that of Meroë. It was from this state that Ethiopia derived her celebrity in the annals of antiquity. Meroë was an extensive district, surrounded by rivers which unite to form the Nile and constituted what is now the south of Sennaar and the north of Abyssinia. Its capital city, of the same name, stood a little below the present Shendy. Like Egypt below the cataracts, it is a land of monuments, upon which its history is written on tables of stone. Heeren's researches relative to this ancient people carry us back beyond "primeval Egypt" in the history of arts and civilization. The grotto-tombs and temples are of rough architecture, but have enough of the Egyptian cast to establish an intimate relationship to it. It is regarded by Heeren as the ruder state of the art which was afterwards perfected in Egypt; and is appealed to as one of the proofs, that the arts and learning of Egypt originated in Meroë, and travelled down the Nile. The historic reliefs, traced upon these temples and tombs, are all of the same Egyptian style, while the architecture is of different styles, and evidently belongs to different periods. It is said, in explanation, that these structures were not adorned with sculpture at the time when they were built, but that Egyptian conquerors, in after ages, obtained possession of the country and inscribed upon its monuments the historic records of their exploits, which we are now permitted to read. This view is sustained by Gau, by Heeren, who also quotes Champollion, and by Hoskins, a recent English traveller in Nubia and Egypt. It is strongly controverted however by others.* But whichever way this question may be settled, the language of the historic reliefs is the same, and their interpretation is not questioned. From them it is inferred that the most flourishing period in the history of Meroë was from 800 to 700 B. C., contemporary with the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Its existence is also traced back to the times of Solomon and even of Moses. It was often governed by Queens, and Solomon's interesting visitor was doubtless from the throne of Meroë. *Candace* was the family name of a race of Meroëic queens, to one of whom reference is made in Acts 8: 27.

Our present inquiries are briefly and satisfactorily answered by the historic reliefs, just mentioned. They are

found upon the island of Meroë, and north of it in Nubia. Sacrifices to the gods, religious ceremonies, and triumphal processions, are sculptured in the rock with clearness and accuracy. On the monuments at Kalabshé, the Egyptian warriors are seen in one place pursuing their flying enemies, in another the Egyptian king is reviewing his prisoners, and the spoils of victory, and in another, is a long procession of captives, bearing the booty, ebony, ostriches, and various animals which belong to Ethiopia, and central Africa. Here a captive queen is imploring for life, and there, her captive warriors are led with halters round their necks by Egyptian conquerors, recognized by their headdress.

In all this variety of representation,—in which the conquered nations are distinguished with remarkable accuracy, by their colour, features, clothing, and arms—"Negroes, known by their profile, occur only once or twice. The remainder, throughout, have the same colour, physiognomy, beard, and clothing; the colour is yellow, the clothing long, the beard short but projecting, the hair black, and on the female hanging down in ties."* The bas-reliefs found on the island of Meroe are entirely similar to those in Nubia. The delineations of the ruling, or priest-caste, are clear and definite. "The countenance has nothing at all of the negro variety: it is a handsome profile; the body is tall and slender; the hair straight or curled; the colour a reddish brown. That the colour in the painted reliefs was certainly that of the people represented, no one can entertain a doubt, who has seen Belzoni's plates of the royal sepulchre which has been opened. I would not, however, be understood to mean, that the colour, in nature, was exactly the same. The artists, in this respect, were constrained by their materials; but I maintain with confidence, that this race was neither fair nor dark, but of a brown colour between the two. I believe I recognise them in the Nubian race. Though the colour, by frequent intermixture with female negro slaves, has become somewhat darker, yet, the same shape, the same profile, and the same moral characteristics, are still to be found, as far as this can possibly be expected in their present degenerate state."†

From the plain testimony, therefore, of all the monu-

* Heeren, vol. 1, p. 381.

† Heeren, vol. 1, 424.

mental records, united with the voice of history, and the researches of modern travellers, it is evident, that in ancient times the negro race was not found in a state of independence in those old and powerful Ethiopic nations upon the Nile above the cataracts. They were mostly indeed dark-coloured, and some tribes were doubtless of a jet black, as at this day; but they were not negroes. They retained the Caucasian physiognomy, and symmetry of form, and intellectual superiority. If we reject this conclusion, we must abandon every principle of interpretation which can give any meaning to the historical inscriptions upon the monuments. The caravan trade into central Africa brought from thence negro slaves to Meroe, as well as to Carthage. This ill-fated race were even then the prey of their more powerful neighbours; and the earliest records of civilization and power, like the escutcheons of modern freedom, are stained and disgraced by the tears of the weeping slave.

All the conclusions to which we arrive in examining Meroe are strengthened when we pass down the Nile into Egypt. Champollion considered the Egyptians as a genuine aboriginal race, having no affinity to the inhabitants of the central countries. Lawrence, in his "*Lectures on Physiology*," has a discussion of this subject, and arrives at a similar result.*

We give the conclusions of Heeren, drawn from an examination of Egyptian monuments, in his own words:—

"It is most agreeable to the rules of sound criticism, first to have recourse to those monuments—the temples and obelisks—of which we can with certainty pronounce, that they belong to the flourishing period of the Pharaohs. These are nearly all covered with works of art, which contain a great number of human figures, either of deities or men, and on that account deserve first to be examined. They acquire, moreover, a great additional value, from their clearly indicating an endeavour in the artists to copy nature, and from their faithfully representing the peculiarities of the different people,—their features, nature of their hair, and so forth. The same proofs that this was the case are found here, upon the temples of the Thebais, as upon the ruins of Persepolis in Asia. Necessity must have led

* Lawrence's *Physiology*, Sec. II. Cap. IV. p. 293.

to it, if the historical meanings were wished to be readily understood; and from this it probably became a rule of ancient art. It is impossible, however, to compare these monuments, as they are now delineated, and to consider the people who erected them to have been Negroes, or any thing like Negroes. I appeal here to the great historical bas-reliefs upon the temples at Thebes, with which Denon has first made us acquainted. The figure of the king comes before us at different times, and upon different occasions. It is always the same head; so that, according to the writer himself, it seems to be a portrait—or rather an ideal portrait. But it is so far from having the least appearance of African lineaments, that it seems rather to approach the Grecian profile. Just as little resemblance is there to be seen of the Negro in more than a hundred heads of his attendants, as well warriors as priests. I appeal as well to the other reliefs upon all the temples above Thebes, so far as they are made known to us in the great work upon Egypt. I appeal, finally, to the very accurately-finished plate of the representations upon the obelisks, for which we are indebted to Zoëga. Compare also the heads of the sphinxes and deities upon the top of the obelisk on Mount Citatorio, and the similar fragment of another in the museum of Cardinal Borgia, and see if there be any thing to be found of a Negro character!

“Should even these proofs fail, the Egyptians have left us still another, in the pictures on the walls in their chambers of the dead. The colours in these are still so fresh and perfect, as to excite the astonishment of every one who examines them. The subjects mostly relate to the domestic life of the Egyptians; the human figure is consequently very frequent. Every thing else is faithfully copied from nature, and therefore it is fair to conclude that these are also. Bruce had already called the attention of the world to these pictures in the royal sepulchres of Thebes; but it was the French expedition that first gave us a clear notion of them, by the labours of the learned who took the pains to examine them. The first striking specimen of them is given in the sepulchres of Eluthias, in the Thebais,—the true school for Egyptian antiquities,—because they represent their whole manner of living, and almost every part of their domestic economy. Women as well as men are here portrayed: ‘the men are red; the women yellow;

the clothes white ; the hair of the men is very dark, curled, but not short, as among the negroes.' Still clearer proofs are found in the royal sepulchres at Thebes ; and, above all, in that most magnificent one which was opened by Belzoni. In these, the light and dark men are expressly distinguished ; and indeed, in such a manner, that the former are represented as the victors, or rulers, and the latter as the conquered, or prisoners. "I remarked," says Denon, "many decapitated figures ; these were all dark, while those who had struck off their heads, and still stood sword in hand, were red." But the most decisive proof is in that of Belzoni, where not merely the light and dark, but, in the prisoners and victors, the three principal colours, white, brown, and black, are distinguished from one another with the nicest accuracy. Indeed, when Denon descended one of the openings which lead to these subterraneous abodes, he found art in a still more certain manner confirmed by nature. A number of mummies, which were not banded up, showed plainly that the hair was long and lank, and the shape of the head itself approximating to the beautiful. There is no need, however, to journey to Egypt to be convinced of this ; the description, and the mummies preserved at Munich, are quite sufficient to ensure conviction.*

The inhabitants of South Africa do not so properly fall within the sphere of this examination, as to demand much research into their peculiar characteristics. They have some points of resemblance to the Negro, but so many entirely distinctive traits, that they have been classed, by intelligent travellers, and by learned men, as a different race, occupying the South, and all the eastern coast to the Equator. "They have a less obtuse facial angle, a convex forehead, and high nose."

Africa then, according to these views, has three aboriginal races, occupying three general divisions of her territory. The Berber race, with some variation on the north, and in eastern Ethiopia,—the Negro, occupying the central countries and the west, from the Senegal to Cape Negro,—and the Caffre in the east and south.

If any one should infer from the melancholy history of the Negro race, as he traces it back into the remotest

* Heeren, vol. II. pp. 87—91.

antiquity, that it cannot be elevated, that its proper element is subjection, it would be difficult to determine whether he were more destitute of philosophy or humanity. The inference would be alike at war with both. Other circumstances besides native and necessary incapacity, are sufficient to explain all the facts which have been alleged against the Negro. The earliest states which were renowned for civilization and political power, were peculiarly favoured by commercial advantages. In the Carthaginian empire, in Egypt and Meroe, commerce was the parent and nurse of civilization and the arts. Their geographical locations and relation to surrounding countries, to Europe, Phœnicia, Arabia, and India, allured them to commercial pursuits, and laid the foundation of all their greatness. Aside from these influences, no nation of antiquity ever emerged from the depths of barbarism. But no such influences have ever reached the Negro race. An almost impassable desert prevented free intercourse with the north; the west was bounded by an ocean to them interminable, and unnavigated; the south ended in desolate and dreary wastes still unexplored, while the central countries, on the eastern border, were visited only for purposes of oppression and avarice, by the caravans trading to Carthage, Egypt, and Meroe. Thus hemmed in from every influence but that of outrage and cruelty, we cease to wonder at the Negroe's history. All the nations of the civilized world might be agitated by revolutions and convulsions, might rise or fall, and it was nothing to them. The trade in his flesh and blood went on, and all those waves of influence which change the characters and destinies of nations, were swallowed up, or arrested by the burning sands, or silent shores on his borders. Christianity was prevented from reaching him, by physical obstacles, by wars, and the final incursion of northern barbarians.

Mahommedanism, however, succeeded in establishing itself in western and central Africa; but the effects it produced were slight. It accorded well with the superstition so characteristic of the African nations, and hardly disturbed the simple fetichism of the native tribes.

The discovery of America awakened a new life in the spirit of commerce, and she spread her wings over the world. But she came not to western Africa with the branch of peace or the horn of plenty. With raven wing, she

bore in her talons the clanking chain and bloody javelin. Commerce, instead of being the parent of civilization of western Africa, was the mother of deeper wrongs and woes, than human nature had ever brought forth.

But the experiments now making there, are of a different nature, and are producing far different results. Were it necessary to defend the Negro character, it could be done triumphantly, from the developements of modern colonization ; far more convincingly, at least, than by the lame appeals which are often made to misinterpreted facts of history. A sufficient apology for the past can be found in the circumstances and influences of past times. But neither apology nor defence, is necessary. "Am I not a man and a brother," was an appeal used with irresistible power by Wilberforce and his associates ; and though it has recently fallen into the rude hands of unquiet spirits, it still contains a sentiment which appeals to the brotherhood of human nature, with a voice to which justice and humanity cannot long be deaf.

ART. VII. REVIEW OF THOLUCK'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

A commentary on the gospel of St. John, by A. Tholuck, D. D. Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. Translated from the German, by Rev. A. Kaufman, minister of the Episcopal Church in Andover, Mass.

THE name of the distinguished theologian and commentator, to whose work we shall direct attention in this article, is already extensively known both in Europe and America. Although he has risen with great rapidity to the eminence, which he has attained, he has done it by efforts evincive of such talents and learning, as not only entitle him to his present fame, but give promise of a still more brilliant reputation. He is not yet forty years of age ; while in maturity of attainments, he stands already by the side of the ablest scholars of Germany. Nor is his distinction merely that, which extensive learning confers upon its professor. He has those higher attributes of genius, which enable him not only to acquire with facility, but to make efficient

use of the fruits of his study. His powers of discourse, both as a writer and a speaker, give him an influence over the minds of others greater, it is said, than that of any one of his distinguished countrymen now living. It is the circumstance, however, that this influence is exerted upon the side of truth, which makes the name of Tholuck chiefly interesting to the friends of religion. Unsurpassed as is his ability to serve the interests of the church, it still is not greater than the zeal and firmness, with which he applies it to this purpose. He has, on all occasions, shown himself an advocate of the true faith. The neologists of his country encounter in him their most determined as well as ablest opposer. The part, which he is already performing, and which the God of nature and of grace has so admirably fitted him to perform, affords cheering reason to hope, that he may have been raised up as one of the destined instruments of subverting that system of rationalism, which has spread over the land of Luther and Melancthon a darkness scarcely less profound, than that which preceded the dawn of the Reformation.

It is greatly to be regretted, that statements in regard to the religious views of Tholuck have been widely circulated in this country, which misrepresent his sentiments and even cast suspicion upon his character as a christian. He has been identified with a class of errorists, who have gone as far perhaps, in their defection from the truth, as any sect, which, in rejecting so much of the spirit, have not rejected also the very name of christianity. It has been said, and said with authority, which has procured extensive credit for the assertion, that Tholuck is a believer in the doctrine of universal salvation. He has not only been claimed by universalists themselves as one of their own number, but has been placed in their ranks by men of dissimilar views. His works, so long as the odium of such a charge is attached to them, will obviously be received with great distrust by orthodox readers, and thus fail of exerting that influence which, in the absence of such an imputation, they might and certainly would exert. It seems necessary therefore, in directing attention to one of his most useful and popular productions, that we should preface the account with an inquiry into the grounds, upon which the representation in question has been made. Although the use here of the term, universalist, may have been merely unguarded, on

the part of those, with whom the charge originated, and not intended, by any means, to be understood in its strict sense, yet it has been, to some extent, so understood, and has thus branded the name of Tholuck with the stigma of all which the epithet implies. Hence, in the remarks which follow, we shall be obliged to have respect to this misapprehension of the charge, as well as to the real charge itself.

The manner, in which the opinion of Tholuck's universalism first arose in this country, would suggest as a very proper course for disproving it, that we should adduce the testimony of opposite witnesses. Since the first appearance of the statements, arraigning the correctness of his views on the subject of future punishment, other accounts have been published from sources equally entitled to credit, and which, if not in all cases contradictory of them, have yet been explanatory in such a sense, as to leave but a very slight foundation for their support. It would be easy to present evidence of this nature to almost any extent. Letters, written by travellers in Europe, and bearing every mark of intelligence and candour, have been spread before the public, expressly denying, that either Tholuck, or any of the more serious christians of Germany are chargeable with the heresy, which has been imputed to them. It is believed, that entire confidence may be reposed in the many statements to this effect, which have appeared in an anonymous form. They have, by no means however, been always of this irresponsible character. They have had, in repeated instances, the sanction of known and highly respectable names. The Rev. Dr. Kurtz, for example, an eminent minister in the Lutheran connexion, who has travelled extensively in Germany, and has enjoyed very special opportunities for information, affirms that he found there no sect, and no individuals of leading influence, similar in their views and spirit to the universalists of this country. The report in opposition to this he contradicts in the following words: "(1.) We ourselves have made the tour of Germany, with the advantage of understanding the language of the country perfectly; we travelled extensively, and became acquainted with a large proportion of the evangelical divines and professors in that country; and now we publicly affirm, that we did not, to our knowledge, fall in company with a single one, who was a universalist, in the Ameri-

can sense of the term. The great mass of the better sort of Germans we found to be as determined in their opposition to this heresy, as can be the most rigid covenanters in Scotland." It may be proper to add, that this testimony accords fully with the unpublished, yet ascertained opinions of other men in the country, who have visited Germany and are familiar with its theology.

But an appeal to the writings of Tholuck himself is undoubtedly the true reference of this question, at least so far as concerns his own vindication. Any one, who has so much as looked into the works of this distinguished man, would esteem it a superfluous labour that we should institute a minute comparison between them and the works of Universalists, in order to show how utterly diverse they are in their whole spirit and tendency. It is notorious, that the advocates of the final happiness of all men, who have appeared among us, have adopted such interpretations of scripture, and such arguments in support of their scheme, as in effect confound the difference between virtue and vice, and take away the practical inducements to a life of holiness. The heavens and the earth are not farther apart than Tholuck and such men. Every line, which he has written, breathes a love of purity, an abhorrence of sin, a reverence for order and law and justice in the divine administration, such as can spring only from genuine sympathy with the spirit of Christ. The proof of this may be found upon almost any page of any one of the numerous works which have issued from his pen. It is furthermore well known, that the universalism of this country rejects such cardinal doctrines as the depravity of human nature, the necessity of regeneration and personal holiness, the divinity and atonement of Christ. These truths, on the contrary, are the very life and soul of the religious system of Tholuck. He brings them into view on all occasions. He not only acknowledges them, as one who has felt their power, but enforces them as a necessary part of the experience of others. It would be useless to cite passages in illustration of this;—all his treatises are full of them. In fact, it would be just as preposterous to rank Tholuck with the Universalists, on account of any supposed deficiency here, as it would be to rank Jonathan Edwards, or Andrew Fuller with them, for the same reason. There will be, there can be no difference of opinion thus far. If we were com-

pelled then to stop here—if we were unable to narrow any farther the grounds on which Tholuck has been proclaimed to the world as a Universalist, are they not already too narrow to warrant such a charge? Admitting that he does hold certain peculiarities of belief, can it be just to designate them by a term, which suggests, and almost unavoidably suggests so much which clearly he does not hold? At variance as he is with the Universalists, in so great a part of his creed, and in all, *all* his spirit, is it considerate, is it honest to confound him with them, as if he were a partaker of all their errors, both of opinion and of practise? Has not he, have not his friends a right to complain that the caution, proper in such a case, has not been duly observed?

That language, so liable to mislead, should have been used thus incautiously, is the more surprising, when it is considered, that Tholuck is, beyond all question, a firm believer in the doctrine of future punishment. In this particular also he differs, if not from the great body, yet certainly from two very large portions of the Universalist denomination. Many of the adherents of this sect maintain, that men suffer in this life all the punishment for sin which they will ever suffer; and that, after death, they enter immediately upon a state of endless enjoyment. Another numerous class of them abandon as fully the idea of a future retribution; but, supposing the soul incapable of a separate existence, allege that its happiness in the world to come will not begin till the re-union of soul and body at the general resurrection, the intermediate state being one of annihilation, or at least of unconscious existence. If there be any sense in which Tholuck is a Universalist, he certainly is not one of these deniers of a retribution hereafter; on the contrary, he holds up the idea every where in the most conspicuous manner. Such a passage, for instance, as the following, affords incontestible proof of his sentiments on this point.* “Only sometimes, as Bacon says, does Nemesis inscribe her admonitions along the great high road of humanity in such prominent lines, that all who pass must read. Hence the history of the world is *a* judgment of the world, but not the final one; and what

* Contained in an article translated by E. Robinson, D. D. in the *Biblical Repository*, Vol. III. No. 12.

the stream of time sweeps off unjudged, unpunished, unrewarded, it bears towards the ocean of eternity, there to receive its final retribution." The comment upon John, 3. 15. is to the same effect. "He who remains without *faith* in the Redeemer, becomes a prey to *ὑπὸ τῆς εἰσ*, *destruction*; he, who *believes* in him, has eternal life. The scriptures mention two kingdoms—the one of life and light, the other that of darkness and death. These kingdoms exist in the present order of things, but they extend, also, into that of futurity. The first kingdom forms a spiritual union with the invisible realm of unfallen spirits; the other, with that of the fallen ones." The remark here, that "he who remains without faith in the Redeemer, becomes a prey to destruction," cannot be understood as a hypothetical remark; that is, as a declaration of what will take place in the case of an event which never happens; the fact being, that all, sooner or later, do exercise faith in the Redeemer, and thus escape the destruction, which they would otherwise suffer. It would be unworthy even of a sophist to stoop to such an artifice. But not to insist upon this: it is evident that Tholuck has no such meaning in reserve, from what he himself immediately subjoins. He says, expressly, that the division of men into subjects of the kingdoms of life and light, darkness and death, is not confined to the present world: it exists also in the world to come; that is, some do actually depart thither without faith; and since "a faithful look upon the Redeemer is the only condition of salvation," such, of course, are not saved. Here, surely, to put no broader construction upon it, is an assent to the doctrine of future punishment. The commentary on John contains many other passages of the same import. They occur also in his sermons. In one of them, where he is accounting for the transient zeal of certain professors of Christianity, he says: * "Their determination to be Christians has not the proper root. It does not spring from a conviction, that we are the most miserable of creatures, unless we have the assistance of Christ; that our wicked hearts, unless he deliver us from them, will prepare for us a hell here upon earth, and beyond the grave; that what is born of the flesh is sold unto sin, and abides therefore under the curse, but that Christ can make us,

* Predig Uber Evang. Math. Kap. 23. v. 1—13.

enemies as we are, the children of God." This extract throws still farther light upon Tholuck's opinion in regard to the future punishment of the rejecters of Christ. The conditions, upon which he here predicates their misery, in the world to come, are such, be it remembered, as he regards as actually fulfilled in the case of a part of mankind; that is, he supposes, that some do in fact go into eternity, who have not obtained the assistance of Christ, who have not been delivered by him from their wicked hearts, who have not been spiritually renewed. The proof of this, if any beyond the language of the sermon itself be necessary, we have in the first extracts. Hence, in the passage last given, we have a declaration of its author's belief, that those who thus "die in their sins," are hereafter miserable beyond comparison. Strangers to any other than their natural birth, born of the flesh and the flesh only, the woes of the curse remain upon them. He supposes, in a word, that there is beyond the grave "a hell," into which all those will be cast, whom the "stream of time sweeps off unjudged, unpunished, unrewarded;" all those, who belong to that "kingdom of darkness and death," which he represents as existing both here and hereafter.

But it is in taking the next step, that we come at length to the point, where only there can arise any real difference of opinion. It may be safe to presume upon the concurrence of all, in the remarks and statements, which have thus far been made. There remains but one article more, in regard to which, the views of Tholuck and the Universalists can be compared. Disagreeing, as he undoubtedly does with all of them, in respect to the tendency of their scheme, and in respect also to their denial of those leading truths of the gospel which have been named, does he yet agree with those among them, who hold to what is called the doctrine of the restorationists? Does he believe that, "all men and fallen spirits will finally be saved?" This has been affirmed. The accuracy of the statment we are now to examine.

It is one objection to its truth, that the sentiment does not appear in the works of Tholuck as we should suppose it would, if it were really entertained by him. Here, for instance, is a full commentary upon the entire gospel of John, and yet so far as we have noticed, it does not contain a single expression which savours of the doctrine of Uni-

versal salvation ! How now, upon the supposition of his belief in this dogma, can we account for such reserve? How incredible is it, that a Universalist should comment, not upon a whole book, but even a single chapter of the Bible, and yet not find, or create occasion to disclose his peculiar views ! But still farther than this, you not only find here no avowal of the sentiment in question, but strong intimations to the contrary. All these passages are decidedly of this description, which were cited as proof of a belief in the infliction of future punishment. Upon every fair principle of interpretation, they import even more than this. There is nothing either in the language of these passages, or in the connexion, which so much as intimates that we are to understand the punishment there spoken of, as limited in its duration. The whole strain of remark in these places, is such as a Calvin, or a Hopkins, might have used, without exposing their orthodoxy to suspicion. How strange, that in speaking of the condition of the wicked after death, he should employ again and again those very terms, which have become, as it were, the stereotyped expressions of the church on this subject, and yet not caution us so much as by a hint, that we are not to attach to them the ordinary signification ! * If, when he declares, that some reject Christ and are "lost," he yet means, that they are not so lost but that they will finally be saved ; if when he speaks of the great leader of apostates, as "from the beginning appointed for destruction," he nevertheless means that he will yet, in his subtilty, frustrate his destiny and re-enter heaven ; if, when he represents the "kingdom of darkness and death," as extending into eternity, he still means that it does not extend through eternity, we have then only to express our surprise, that he has shown himself so inexpert, not to say disingenuous, in using language, whose obvious import is so remote from what he intends.

But there appears to be evidence in the case of a more positive nature. We have fallen upon passages in his works, which it is inconceivable that a Universalist, who understands his creed, should either write or approve. How can we regard, in any other light, for instance, the passage which follows. † "The last day of judgment

* The expressions marked occur in the commentary on John, c. 3. 15. ; 3. 17—18 ; 8. 44.

† Biblical Repository, Vol III. No. 12.

forms, as Calvin strikingly suggests, the back-ground of the whole course of God's judgments in the world. But what, according to the Christian Revelation, will be the result of the judgement of this great day? It will be the *awful* separation of the children of the kingdom from those who are cast out. The great scene, where both have hitherto lived together, will be changed. *This is the last result of that judgment of the world, which stretches throughout all the history of the world.*" The creed of a man who writes thus, must run, we should think, in some such strain as this: "I believe in a day of judgment for the righteous and the wicked. I believe, that these two classes will then be in a most awful manner separated from each other; that the children of the kingdom will be received to heaven, but all others cast out: that there will be no reversion of this decision—it being the last result of God's judgment of the human race."

It would seem that his preaching is, or has been, in the same style. In a sermon, founded on the parable of the virgins, from which we have already translated, he thus speaks: "The expression, coming of Christ, has in its scriptural use, various senses. In some places, where Christ refers to his second coming, he intends the out-pouring of his spirit upon his disciples, after his ascension to the Father. At other times he speaks of his advent, and means by it, his re-appearance at the end of time, when he will summon to judgment, and to eternal happiness, or condemnation, those who shall then be alive, as well as the dead of all previous ages. Finally, he appears in many passages to intend, by his coming, the precise moment when death removes mankind into the future world, and places them, until the day of general judgment, in a situation where they have the presentiment of eternal happiness, or eternal misery." It is hazarding nothing to say, that any one in this country professing to be a Universalist, who should thus expound the scriptures, would be considered as false to his principles, and would be disowned by the party. If Tholuck can thus expound them, and yet believe in the final restoration of all sinners, whether men or devils, to a state of happiness, it must be that he either crosses his own track, is self-contradictory, or that in the very spirit of rationalism he makes a distinction between

the theologian and the interpreter, and is not, therefore, to be understood as assenting to his own expositions of the Divine word!

But while the foregoing extracts contain so much which it is difficult to explain, if the author of them supposes, that *none* of the human race will eventually fail of salvation, they contain nothing, it must be confessed, at variance with the idea, that some may possibly enter heaven, who are not received thither at death. It is well known that many of the German divines, of the first character for talents and piety, allow themselves to speculate, with a degree of freedom, which the orthodox in this country neither practice nor approve, in regard to the condition of human souls, in the interval between death and the judgment. There is a disposition among them to regard this period as a sort of second probation. They suppose it possible, that the door of heaven will not be wholly closed, till the trial of the great day; and thus, that some who die without piety will obtain it, ere they pass the final limit, and so be saved. There may be some difference of opinion as to the extent, to which they suppose that mankind will be admitted to this second day of grace; but for the most part, they restrict it to such as have not been favoured here with a distinct knowledge of the gospel. "Many of the Germans," says Dr. Kurtz, in the statement already mentioned, "believe that the gospel will be preached in its purity to all people, and that none will be consigned to eternal punishment, until they shall have heard it and rejected the plan of salvation, which it proposes. Heathen die without hearing it, and many in Christian lands leave the world without having heard it proclaimed in its unadulterated simplicity. This is particularly the case in reference to multitudes in Europe. These, say the individuals alluded to, will have an opportunity of salvation hereafter—the gospel will be published to them in a middle state, intervening between death and the resurrection: if they embrace it, they will be saved: if they reject it, their destiny will be unalterably fixed for ever."* The sentiment here

* Anyone who will read the section of Dr. Knapp, "On the salvation of the heathen," will perceive an inclination in the mind of this pious and distinguished theologian towards a somewhat similar, if not, in fact, the same view. The whole article is in the spirit of these in-

exhibited, the author of the foregoing statement attributes to Tholuck; and it is not improbable that he entertains it. He himself, in a letter addressed to an individual in this country, and * which is in the possession of the public, alludes to the same idea as widely prevalent in Germany, and although he does not express himself with entire clearness, rather intimates, that he gives it his own approval. But if this be the extent of his Universalism, (and if we try him by his published opinions, we cannot well come to any other conclusion,) it is surely a very different affair from the final deliverance of all men from punishment in the future world. In the first place, it affords not a ray of hope to all those who live in Christian lands, and are acquainted with the way of salvation, but treat it with contempt, and die without availing themselves of its benefits. Their eternity of woe begins at the moment of death. In the next place, the doctrine affirms nothing as to the issue of this second trial, to which it supposes that a part of mankind may be admitted. It leaves us at liberty to believe, that agreeably to the analogies of this life, great numbers there also will prefer sin to holiness, and thus exclude themselves forever from the kingdom of heaven.

It is upon such grounds, that Tholuck has been charged with discarding what we regard as the scriptural view of future punishment, and with holding the scheme of the Universalists, or Restorationists of this country. If the truth upon the subject has been presented, he certainly is to be acquitted as to the substance of the charge; and yet we do not plead, that he should be dismissed altogether without censure. The degree of error into which he has fallen, arises from a spirit of speculation, which is but too nearly allied to that presumption, which would be "wise above what is written." It is a spirit, from which the works of the most pious of his countrymen are not yet sufficiently free. It is to be feared, that with all their unquestionable def-

troductory remarks:—"When treating of the conditions of salvation established in the Christian scheme, we speak in reference to Christians; *i. e.* those who have opportunity and capacity to become acquainted with Christianity, and to convince themselves of its truth, without undertaking to say what reasons for attaining salvation God may give those who are ignorant of Christianity, &c."

* It may be found in the *Christian Watchman*, published in Boston, April 22, 1836.

erence for the bible, they have not yet learned to bow to its decisions with an implicit assent ; that they too often hear its voice and receive its light through the medium of a philosophy, which imposes on them false impressions. Yet on the whole we should rejoice, that they have made so much advance, rather than complain that they have made so little. When it is considered against what recklessness of scepticism the friends of religion in Germany have had to contend, the wonder is, that they hold the truth even with so much purity. May the degree of error, which yet cleaves to it, soon pass away in its turn ; and thus may it be shown, that if something is still wanting to the entire soundness of the church of Christ there, it is the feebleness, not of incipient disease, but of that sort, which oppresses the body, after sickness has spent its violence upon it, and from the effects of which although convalescent, it cannot recover in a moment !

We will now pass to a brief notice of the work, named at the head of this article. The commentary on John is not regarded by those, who are acquainted with the other works of Tholuck, as specially distinguished in comparison with them, for the originality of its views, or the extent of its learning. He shows indeed even here, that he is capable of such views, and has the resources of the most varied learning at his command. As a monument, however, of his scholarship and exegetical talent, it will not rank so high as several of his other productions. Some readers may not only experience a disappointment of this nature, but take exception perhaps to something like an occasional development of that turn for the mystical, which marks so strongly the German mind. An example of this occurs in the comment on Chap. 1 : 11. "That inward light, which constitutes the living substratum of every human spirit, now appeared impersonated among men ; but those who had not previously apprehended it within themselves, still continued ignorant of it, when it appeared before them in an outward personal manifestation." So also upon Chap. 18 : 38. "When God ceases to give a testimony of himself in the moral and religious consciousness of man, how can man attain to a recognition of the objective existence of God and divine things ? Thus with the contempt of a superficial man of the world towards every thing, which lies beyond the sphere of the finite, and

which requires the highest longing in man, the Procurator here cries out, "what is truth!" Pilate here represents an entire class of distinguished Romans, who in the contest between systems and between that of the religious structure of their own people, which was only partially illuminated by truth, poured cold contempt upon every effort to search into divine things; and this they did because they had extinguished the inward testimony of God in their ethico-religious consciousness by a shallow worldly life, and as a consequence, could not apply the true criterion of all philosophical and religious doctrines." Such sentences, however, bear but a small proportion to the whole body of the work, and cannot essentially affect its value.

It may be thought that in some places where Tholuck treats of the miracles of our Saviour, he does not always take his ground as a supernaturalist with sufficient openness and decision. We do not intend by any means, that he throws a veil over his opinions here, so that we are left in doubt as to what they really are. It is impossible for any one to be more explicit than he usually is in his acknowledgement of the divine power, with which Christ wrought "both signs and wonders." The attacks of the rationalists upon this key-stone in the evidences of christianity, are opposed by him, as a believer in revelation should oppose them.—The extent of the stricture is, if in fact there be room for it at all, that in reference to one or two cases, which some might regard as miraculous, he adopts, or at least favours natural methods of explanation. There is not room for extracts. We would refer to what is said in regard to the appearance of the dove at the baptism of our Lord, and in regard also to the circumstances of his first acquaintance with Nathaniel.

We assent to the remark of the translator, in the preface, that "a fervour and glow of Christian devotion," pervades all the writings of Tholuck. This is especially true of the commentary on John, if we compare it with the usual style of German commentary. If we compare it, however, with similar works in our own language, there is a great deficiency. The practical relations of truth are not exhibited with any degree of that directness, which is so characteristic of our English commentators. The reader is left altogether too much to merely such an application of the text, and the criticism upon it, as his own heart may

prompt him to make. The fault of Tholuck, in this particular, is the common fault of his countrymen. Even those of them who enter into the views of the inspired writers most fully, fail to present them so as to develop and strengthen a sense of personal responsibility. They do not address themselves sufficiently to the heart and the conscience. They are occupied too much with the letter, or rather, they are not enough occupied with the spirit, of the sacred volume. If the Germans, without surrendering any of the accuracy for which they are distinguished, would approach nearer to the manner of Leighton, and Scott, and Doddridge, in the practical turn which these latter give to their expositions, we should then have, as the result of this combination of qualities so seldom united, a species of commentary more perfect than any which has often appeared.

The excellencies, which so fully counterbalance these, or any other defects which might be pointed out, it is unnecessary to specify. The work is before the public; and will vindicate its claim to a high place in the esteem of the friends of sacred learning. Mr. Kaufman has judged correctly, in supposing that a translation of it would be acceptable to the religious community. In making it accessible to English readers, he has entitled himself to their thanks and patronage. The manner in which he has performed the duty does credit to his taste and scholarship. Had he, in some instances, paid more regard to the demands of our own language, and adhered less closely to the original, it would have been an improvement. It was, probably, through inadvertence, that part of the extract from Theod. Mopsuest, on the eighty-seventh page, is obviously mistranslated. The last sentence, "For it were better to say that John testified, saying," &c. should be rendered, "For it were superfluous to say, that John testified, saying, that he beheld the spirit, if all who were present were also witnesses of the vision." Both the Greek and the context require this translation. Upon page 287, we have the word "resuscitation," employed in a sense which neither usage, nor the nature of the case, will warrant. It signifies, properly, restoration, not from actual death, but from a state of insensibility, a state of apparent extinction of life. Hence, to call the rising of Lazarus, from the grave, a "resuscitation," suggests an idea utterly foreign both to the truth,

and the intention of the writer. It would imply, that the brother of Mary and Martha had not been actually dead, but was so only in appearance; and thus, in fact, that there was no real miracle in the case!* The mistake is, that the term in question is taken as synonymous with resurrection, to which it does not correspond. There are some minor inaccuracies, which the eye of the translator has, no doubt, ere this detected, and which will disappear in a second edition of the book.

In bringing this article to a close, we deem it not inappropriate to allude to a topic which is brought fairly before us by the work which we have been considering. From the frequency with which Tholuck refers, in this commentary, to the works of the early Christian writers, we can judge both of the extent to which the Germans prosecute this species of learning, and of the estimation in which they hold it. How entirely neglected, among us, is this whole field of investigation! It is a region into which the most enterprising students here but seldom venture. If they glean, from a hasty attention to ecclesiastical history, knowledge enough to recount the names of some of the leading Christian fathers, and the titles, perhaps, of a few of their works, it is, for the most part, the extent of their acquaintance with this portion of the literature of the church. The candidate for the ministry, who, in his preparatory course, has done so much as to read, in the original, one of the apologies of Justin Martyr, or one of the epistles of Cyprian, or a homily of Chrysostom, has earned for himself, a distinction which few can aspire to share with him. It is certainly to the discredit of sacred learning in this country, that the standard of theological attainments is in this respect so low.† Not to mention any of the more solid benefits which one might thus secure, who can conceive of an object of more rational curiosity, than to

* "Resuscitated" is used in the same manner, p. 79.

† These writers have claims upon the classical, as well as the theological student. "The Christian fathers, without being precisely philosophers, were the boldest thinkers and best writers of the time. We find them fearlessly criticising the substance of this (Cicero's republic) and the other valuable treatises of the classical authors; approving what they considered worthy to be approved, and condemning the rest without scruple, while the Pagan writers of the same period only dwelt, with a barren and indiscriminate admiration, upon the structure of the language." *North American Review*, Vol. 7, No. 4.

desire to know how those men thought, and reasoned, and wrote, who almost sat at the very feet of the Apostles, and who, at all events, had very near access to the first sources of Christianity?* We cannot but hope, that the testimony of so competent a judge as Tholuck, to the value of the early Latin and Greek fathers, may contribute to rescue them from their present unmerited neglect in this country, and attract to them some degree of that attention which they will so amply repay.

ART. VIII. AN ENQUIRY INTO SOME OF THE CAUSES
OF DISEASE AMONG THE CLERGY.

By CHARLES A. LEE, M.D., New York.

THE frequency of ill health among clergymen, is a matter of general remark. A few years in the ministry is sufficient, at the present day, to break down the strongest constitutions; and the most vigorous physical powers, yield under the required routine of duties. Increasing numbers are yearly becoming invalids, or fall beneath the weight of their labours, when, perhaps, just entering on fields of extensive usefulness. The ministry, which was once considered, and truly so, as favourable to longevity, is now more fatal to life and health than almost any trade or profession that can be named. Throughout New England, until within a few years, the clergy generally attained to a vigorous old age, and went down to the grave "like a shock of corn fully ripe;" now, they are often cut off like the green blade, whose heart has been eaten, or its root severed, by some hidden worm. "Then our hardy fathers knew not dyspepsy or bronchitis even by name. Ennui, prostration, and debility entered not into their vocabulary. They ate well, digested well, slept well, and *spoke well*; all the functions of life moved on harmoniously, and the re-

* It would seem, however, that this is a department of learning which needs to be, not introduced *de novo*, but simply revived among us. Cotton Mather's *Magnalia*, for instance, and the works of other divines who were contemporary with him, show, that there was a time when attention to these studies was considered a very important part of ministerial preparation.

sult was, a cheerful, a useful, and a happy race of men. But alas, how changed ! Now, minister, invalid, dyspeptic, are synonymous, or, at least, convertible terms. But few enjoy robust health, or at least, will allow that they do. Some are afflicted with one ailment, some with another. One has the throat distemper, another the dyspepsy: one suffers from palpitation, another from vertigo, and all have some "thorn in the flesh."—The consequence is an imperfect performance of duty ; and instead of an open, cheerful expression of countenance, we often see a wrinkled, contracted, sinister look, which speaks any thing but in favour of the benign religion of the gospel. Thus religion may suffer, from the physical sufferings of its professors and teachers. How often do we see men of superficial minds, imbibing a prejudice against Christianity from observing the care-worn, woe-begone features of some of its advocates. If this, say they, is the influence of your religion, to throw gloom over the countenance, and beget a melancholy so deep, that "he that runs may read it" in the face, then we wish to have nothing to do with it, we prefer to follow the religion of nature, "which rejoices through all her works." The preservation of health then, among the clergy, becomes a matter of high importance, not only as connected with their usefulness and personal happiness, but also from the fact just noticed, that disease and debility are reflected in the features, and while the cause is concealed, and may be mistaken, the effect is manifest, and leads to wrong conclusions.

With respect to the causes of bad health, we presume no argument will be needed to prove that it is, in almost every instance, the result of the direct infringement of one or more of the laws decreed by the Creator to be essential to the well-being of the bodily organs ; and that the knowledge and observance of these laws or conditions, is within our own power. The opinion has been maintained by some, and is still acted upon by many, that diseases have no necessary connexion with our conduct, but are sent by a wise Providence, either as a chastisement of our sins, or for some other wise purpose. Accordingly, when a man is prematurely removed from scenes of active usefulness, how often do we hear the exclamation, what a mysterious dispensation ! when the truth is, that life has been sacrificed by the neglect of those very laws, an observance of which

has been made essential to our well-being. It would, indeed, have been a mysterious providence, if not a miraculous interference, if such a result had not followed such a course of conduct. The belief that God does not act so capriciously in the bestowal of health, and the infliction of disease, is by no means incompatible with the doctrine of a particular Providence. Scripture, as well as observation, abundantly shows that the material world, and the beings that inhabit it, are acted upon by secondary causes or agencies under the direction and superintendence of a beneficent Overseer. Were the doctrine true, that disease is solely the result of circumstances beyond our control, then all attempts to guard against it would be entirely useless, and an attention to our religious and moral improvement, would render all hygienic rules superfluous. Divine authority assures us, that the age of man is three score years and ten; a period which now suffices to sweep off nearly two and a half generations of our race. We then are brought to this dilemma, either to impeach the veracity of Scripture, or maintain that a large proportion of the human family live in the violation of those laws from which alone health can spring. We choose the latter.

At the same time, it must be conceded that there are agencies, from which we shall never be entirely able to protect ourselves. Such are atmospheric vicissitudes; epidemic and contagious disorders; and unavoidable exposure to known unhealthy influences; to which may be added constitutional or hereditary predisposition. All these may be the cause of disease, while at the same time, the utmost attention is paid to the ascertained means of preserving health. No one, however, after a full survey of the subject, can hesitate to believe, that exemption from disease, as a general rule, depends mainly on the care which is taken to fulfil those conditions which the Creator has decreed to be essential to the due action and preservation of the various bodily organs.

One grand cause, though an indirect one, of the frequency of ill health among the clergy, *is the demand for more labour than they can safely perform.* This is a day of excitement, of novelties, of commotion, in all the departments of civil, political, and religious life. The public mind is in a state of intoxication, and it demands materiel to keep it up to the highest possible pitch of exhila-

ration. There must be no flagging. If one clergyman cannot produce the required result, he loses his popularity; his labours become "flat, stale, and unprofitable;" and he must either give place to another, or call some fiery, flaming "evangelist" to his assistance. Quiet and unobtrusive piety, has been exchanged for noisy profession, and the closet turned into the conference room. The spirit of the age has invaded the sanctuary, and Christianity drunk deeply at the troubled fountain. The truth, however, now begins to be acknowledged, that the ministry should, as one body, have resisted these innovations, and high-pressure excitements; they should have stood and contended manfully for the "old paths," which experience had demonstrated to be "paths of safety and peace," and not yielded to that fiery tide which now threatens either to sweep them from their fields of labour, or from the earth itself. But while a vicious public opinion has too frequently laid an unlawful restraint upon the clergy, urging them further in the discharge of their duties than their own judgment or physical ability would warrant; instead of standing upon their "reserved rights," and resisting all unreasonable dictation, come from whatever quarter it may, they have too often yielded a tame subserviency, when their own safety, as well as the interests of religion, demanded an uncompromising resistance. Instead of acting as ambassadors of the Most High, and divinely commissioned, they are compelled to become mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water," and humbly ask their deacons, or their sessions, or their vestry, what duties they are expected to perform. But these things ought not to so be. Where, we would ask, are the physical powers which can stand the constant round of engagements, the high anxiety of mind, the wear and tear of unremitted, intense, and exhausting labours, demanded by a protracted meeting, or even by a feverish congregation, who seem to think that the clergyman is to work out their salvation as well as his own. It cannot be found, except in the case of a few "sons of thunder," whose element is excitement, who cannot live out of troubled waters, and whose grand secret of moving the mind, lies in outraging all propriety, by some novel mode of access to the imaginations, hopes, fears, and passions of their hearers. They understand, if they do not practice, the precept of Horace,

"Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi,"

and their tones and modulations of voice are artificially adapted to the expression of passion, without the trouble of feeling it. Such men are not in danger of being consumed by fires of their own kindling. Practice has made them expert, in exhibiting emotion where there is none; in manifesting feeling, where there is insensibility; and portraying passion, where the heart, like the Siberian mammoth, is surrounded with ice. The vociferous evangelist, whose muscles alone are called into action, and whose work is strictly mechanical, has been proved to be capable of performing a vast amount of labour with impunity; while the man of genuine sensibility and tender feeling, deeply sympathizing with those who begin to feel the weight of things eternal, pressed by a sense of his own momentous responsibility, is generally much exhausted by the ordinary duties of his calling. One cause then of ill-health to which ministers are particularly exposed, is this inordinate mental excitement, which even the ordinary exercise of their profession is sufficiently calculated to produce. The responsibilities resting upon the clergy are indeed weighty and arduous; they are as far above those of any other calling, as the concerns of eternity outweigh those of time: and yet, if properly considered, if viewed in the light of reason, of Scripture and God's Providence, they will not cause that feverish anxiety, or that mental depression, which in some cases, they appear to produce. Man, it is true, requires excitement; but to be healthy, it must be moderate; he also requires relaxation and amusement, the nature and degree of which must be governed by circumstances. By amusement, we do not mean, what is often called such, but is any thing else rather; but that unbending of the mind, that relaxation of pursuit, that change of employment, which, not only gives a breathing time, but causes a gentle exhilaration of spirits. Man is a social being, and he must find time for the exercise of the charities of social and domestic life; he is a hospitable being, and, if a bishop, must be "given to hospitality," "not to wine," which, in Paul's philosophy, are not synonymous.

We have attributed the illhealth of clergymen to too great a demand for ministerial labour, as an indirect cause of no slight efficiency and especially in time of a revival; what these services generally are, may be learned from the following extract from the "narrative of the late revival in

the Presbytery of Geneva in 1830." "The course of weekly labour has been, three services on the Sabbath; a meeting for enquiry and another for prayer on Monday evening; a service more particularly to the unawakened on Tuesday evening; social prayer meetings in different sections of the village, and lectures in the more distant neighbourhoods on Wednesday evening; the Bible Class, followed by a season of prayer on Thursday evening; a meeting for the instruction of young converts, and another for prayer on Friday evening; and on Saturday evening, a prayer meeting for a special blessing on the labours of the Sabbath. The day was principally employed in visiting from house to house." In addition, it is stated that a *protracted meeting* was held, of several days continuance. Should such a state of things continue *long* in a place, the amount of labour required by one town would suffice, in the course of a few years, to use up all the clergymen in the country.

A frequent cause of disease among ministers, is preaching in small and ill-ventilated rooms, such as basements, session houses, &c. The importance of pure air to the healthy discharge of the vital functions, is universally known, yet churches and places of public assemblage are often constructed, as if men were amphibious, and a pure atmosphere of no consequence whatever. When we consider that a constant supply of oxygen, is necessary for the support of life, and that a man ordinarily consumes 45,000 cubic inches of this gas in twenty-four hours; and, moreover, that carbonic acid gas is continually formed by respiration and is unfit for the purposes of life, we shall see how essential to health it is that the air should not be suffered to deteriorate. Five hundred persons will thus consume in a single hour 1,041,500 cubic inches of oxygen; and an equal quantity of carbonic acid gas is formed. It can thus be demonstrated that the air in apartments which are crowded and ill-ventilated, must, in the course of two hours, be many times breathed over; for each person inhales and exhales, about twenty cubic inches twenty times a minute or 24,000 in an hour, and by a congregation of one thousand, 24,000,000 cubic inches are taken into the lungs and exhaled every hour; or 3,250 hogsheads, every two hours. Now if this air is not renewed, the greater part of the oxygen, or the vital portion will be consumed, and its place supplied by a deadly gas. The consequence is, that the elasticity of the air is lost, and speaking becomes

excessively laborious ; and what renders the evil still greater, is that the power of exertion is lessened by the want of the stimulus of the oxygen, at the very time when the greatest strength is required. In this manner the organs of voice often are impaired, and chronic laryngitis supervenes, terminating in ulceration, emaciation and death.

Clergymen are also particularly apt to suffer from exposure to cold and damp air, while in a state of perspiration. This is peculiarly the case in times of great excitement, when the powers of body and mind are taxed to their greatest extent. The consequence is a derangement of the capillary circulation—the blood is thrown upon the internal organs, and acute or chronic disease in some form is the certain result. The constitution may be so gradually undermined by repeated exposure, that the particular exciting cause is not very obvious, and may be mistaken.

Intense study and severe mental exertion, are often causes of disease among clergymen. There is such an intimate, though to us mysterious connection between the mind and body, that they mutually act and react on each other, and the former cannot be wound up to a high pitch of excitement, without the latter suffering a corresponding depression. It should be remembered that a corporeal organ, the brain, is the seat of the mind, and the medium through which it maintains an intercourse with the surrounding world. The mind is accordingly affected by causes which affect the brain. Though the absurd theories, and the indiscreet zeal of phrenologists, may have thrown discredit on this department of mental philosophy, yet there are numerous phenomena, connected with the moral and intellectual faculties of man, both in a state of health and disease, which prove this reciprocal influence. Thus, we see grief and anxiety destroy appetite, and intense mental application makes us insensible to the want of food ; on the other hand, a disordered state of the digestive organs impairs the mental powers, and occasions that dread of evil and those gloomy forebodings which are termed hypochondria from the situation of the organs, whose derangement occasions the disease. Intoxication confuses the memory and judgement, and the habitual use of any alcoholic stimulus debilitates the mind by its influence on the brain, and often terminates in insanity. Who has not experienced the depressing effects of a vitiated atmosphere, not

only upon his physical, but his moral powers. The variable feelings, to which many literary men are subject, are probably caused by changes in the atmosphere, perhaps not cognizable by any known instrument. How imprudent then is it for the Christian, if an invalid, to make *his feelings* the test of his Christian character. Indeed it is painful to read the diaries of many eminent Christians and see how they suffered from the imaginary belief of the withdrawal of God's favour, manifested as they supposed, by the variable state of their feelings. The grand difficulty, in many of these cases, lies in a deranged condition of the digestive organs. Dryden was a close observer of mental phenomena, and he says, "When I have a grand design, I ever take physic and let blood; for when you would have pure swiftness of thought and fiery flights of fancy, you must have a care of the pensive part; in fine you must purge the belly." Carneades, one of the most famous disputants of antiquity, was accustomed to take large doses of white hellebore as a preparation to refute the dogmas of the Stoics. "A physician of my acquaintance," says Dr. Israeli, "was earnestly entreated by a female patient to give a name to her unknown complaints; this he found not difficult to do; he declared that her disorder was *atmospherical*. It was the disorder of her frame under damp weather, which was reacting on her mind; and physical means, by operating on her body, might be applied to restore her to her half-lost senses." The reaction of the body upon the mind, is clearly shown in the frightful dreams which disturb the invalid, or even a healthy person when the stomach is overloaded. In many cases, the most rational logic to make men reasonable is doubtless to be found in the lancet, the blue-pill, salts and senna. We have known clergymen, whose pulpit exercises in the morning were characterized by genius and eloquence: in the afternoon they were dull and sleepy: and we have said to ourselves, would that these men fasted one day in the week; it is beastly to allow the stomach to steal away the brains. It is not without great plausibility, that the writer above quoted remarks, "our domestic happiness often depends on the state of the biliary and digestive organs, and the little disturbances of conjugal life may be more efficaciously cured by the physician than by the moralist; for a sermon misapplied, will never act so directly as a sharp medicine." The history of

many a reformed drunkard, will confirm the justness of this remark. Descartes went so far as to say, that if any means can be found to render men wiser and more ingenious than they have been hitherto, such a method must be sought from the assistance of medicine. The learned Henry Stevens, after a severe ague, had such a disgust of books that the very thought of them excited terror for a considerable time. How often does insanity result from some corporeal disease. What facility and freedom of thought and mental effort results from the use of the warm or vapor baths. When, therefore, the physician avows himself an advocate for the application of medical and dietetical means to many moral diseases, he only acts upon the principle which all admit, viz. the connection of mind and body; and it by no means follows, that he denies, that the former may not exist independent of the latter. He only maintains, that such defects of the mind as depend on those of the organization, may be remedied by remedying that same organization: for while in the flesh, the brain is the mysterious organ of the mind, and physical causes which affect the one, must also influence the other. We arrive then, in the language of Plutarch, to this conclusion.—“Should the body sue the mind before a court of Judicature for damages, it would be found that the mind would prove to have been a ruinous tenant to its landlord.” And most especially would this hold true in relation to the large body of country clergymen, who, in addition to the ordinary wear and tear of mental exertion, have superadded the care and anxiety for the support and education of a dependent family, with an inadequate and stinted salary, often doled out with the most miserly parsimony.

With respect to the brain, we may remark, that it is subject, as regards its exercise, to the same laws as the other organs of the body.—It may suffer from inactivity, as well as from being over-worked, and its functions only can acquire readiness and strength, by being moderately exercised after proper intervals of repose. That clergymen are not exempt from insanity brought on by excessive mental application, our Lunatic Asylums will abundantly testify; and the system of religious excitement, at present in fashion, does not tend to diminish the evil. Tissot has truly remarked, that the disorders produced by the efforts of the mind, fall soonest upon such as are incessantly engaged in the con-

temptation of the same object. In this case, he adds, there is only one part of the sensorium acted upon, and that is kept always on the stretch ; it is not relieved by the action of other parts, and therefore is sooner fatigued and injured. Whether this be the correct hypothesis or not, the fact can not be disputed. Boerhaave, after a long period of intense study, suffered for six weeks from excitement of the brain, bordering on insanity. It is now generally conceded that the mind even of Sir Isaac Newton, was, for a considerable time, disordered by excessive application, and that he never altogether recovered from the shock. Sir Humphry Davy, Walter Scott, Canning, Whitbread, Castlereagh, Romilly, and numerous others, of distinguished talent, have been arrested, in mid career, by fatal disease induced by inordinate action of the brain. In an obituary notice of the celebrated Dr. McCrie, who died during the last year in Edinburgh, it is stated, that a short time before his death, he expressed an opinion that he should die soon and suddenly ; and complained "*that his strength had been over-tasked, that he had too much to do, and that he should never bring his life of Calvin to a conclusion.*" The result was as he had prophesied. Soon after preaching twice on the Sabbath, he gradually sunk into an apoplectic stupor, from which he never recovered. How often have we seen clergymen, when called to the charge of a congregation, especially in the city, enter upon an amount of mental exertion, altogether incompatible with the continued enjoyment of a sound mind in a sound body. It seems that nothing short of actual personal experience, will convince men, that the mind as well as the body, can not be over-worked with impunity. There can be no doubt, that a large proportion of the cases of dyspepsy are caused by the concentration of vital action in the brain, thus leaving the digestive organs unprovided with the requisite nervous stimulus. Every one knows that violent emotions of the mind, such as grief, arrest the progress of digestion : and the influence of the brain and mind over the heart and lungs, is no less manifest. It is, however, a wise provision of Providence, that intellectual effort, so far from being injurious to health, when properly regulated and conjoined with appropriate bodily exercise, is probably conducive to longevity. This will appear from the following

table of the ages which some of the most distinguished natural philosophers have attained.

	Age.		Age.
1. Bacon, - -	78	13. La Place, - -	77
2. Buffon, - -	81	14. Leeuenhoek, - -	91
3. Copernicus, - -	70	15. Leibnitz, - -	70
4. Cuvier, - -	64	16. Linneus, - -	72
5. Davy, - -	51	17. Newton, - -	85
6. Euler, - -	76	18. Tycho Brahe, - -	55
7. Franklin, - -	85	19. Whiston, - -	95
8. Gallileo, - -	78	20. Wollaston, - -	62
9. Halley, - -	86		
10. Herschel, - -	84	Total, -	1494
11. Kepler, - -	60		
12. La Lande, - -	75	Average, -	74 7-10

This statement, if it prove nothing more, evidently shows that the attainment of a good old age, is not necessarily incompatible with severe mental application.

Another frequent cause of ill health, especially among the clergy of our large cities, is the want of appropriate exercise. It is a matter of surprise, how many contrive to live as long as they do, when we reflect that all their corporeal exercise consists in a walk of a mile or two, daily; or, occasionally, a ride of a few miles into the country.

Were the body not debilitated by inaction, the system would better resist the influence of those other causes which tend to undermine and destroy the health. If the demand for ministerial labour be unusually great, that demand cannot be met, except by those whose bodies are strengthened by a course of systematic exercise; and, were such a course of invigorating the system pursued, conjoined with suitable regimen, there are, probably, few who would not find themselves able to discharge, with ease and safety, all the duties rationally required of them. Many have gained the reputation of having worn themselves out by hard labour, when a more righteous verdict would have been, *felo de se*, by bodily indolence and self-indulgence. Late rising, high living, inactive habits, and much speaking, have brought on the *bronchitis*, and then the victim of his own habits is regarded as a martyr in the cause of religion. There is a fatal delusion prevalent, on this subject, all over the country. It is, some how or other, con-

sidered undignified for a minister to take such exercise as requires much self-exertion, or which may perchance induce fatigue. We have known distinguished divines who have regained their health by a pedestrian tour among the Alpine hills of Switzerland, or the highlands of Scotland, but who, in this country, would think it degrading to take a moderate journey on foot. It must not be supposed that arduous labours are the sole cause of clerical disease: in many cases they have had little, if any agency; and where they have appeared to break down the constitution, other causes, quite as efficient, have been at the same time in operation; not the least important of which, is the one under consideration. It is generally agreed, by medical writers and practical physicians, that from three to four hour's active exercise, in the open air, daily, is necessary for the preservation of health. >This has been the practice of the most distinguished literary men who have ever lived, and who have borne testimony to the fact, that, with this amount of exercise, they could accomplish more, by one hour's study, than they could in three with but one hour's exercise. Our most celebrated scholars, it is well known, study far fewer hours than many plodding geniuses, who, though they sit over their books sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, yet never rise above mediocrity. There must be a great change, in this respect, in the habits of the clergy, if they do not wish to become useless in the world, or to find premature graves. Pliny, justly calls those cripples, who, neglecting bodily discipline, cultivate only the powers of the mind. If those who do thus, knew how they were shackling and fettering the immortal intellect, they would rouse from their lethargy, and proportion the bodily to the mental exercise. We would say to the clergy, in the language of one of their own profession, beware how you neglect the corporeal frame-work, with which all your intellectual operations are so closely connected. Let this frame-work moulder by sloth, or be shaken by excess, or be crushed by overstrained exertion, and you are lost to the cause, to which you might, otherwise, have been long and usefully devoted. If you do not go down to an early grave, you will be dead men while you seem to live. Oh, how many departed ones have been lamented, as martyrs to excessive application, who

have died "as the fool dieth," the miserable victims of indolence and luxury."

The evils arising from deficient exercise, both to the mind and body, are unfortunately too well known. The circulation becomes languid, especially in the extreme vessels; the appetite and digestion weak; the muscles soft and flabby; the respiration heavy and imperfect, and the blood so ill-conditioned, that it furnishes an inadequate stimulus for healthy and vigorous action. The intellectual operations are conducted in a feeble and unsatisfactory manner, and cannot be long sustained. The following cases, from the first number of the *American Annals of Education*, furnish a forcible, but melancholy illustration, of what we wish to enforce. "A. had valuable gifts, perfected by two years' academic, four years' collegiate, and three years' theological studies. He preached, gave much promise, and then died of a stomach disease. He contracted it when a student. He did not alternate bodily with mental labour, or he had lived, and been a blessing to the church. When he entered on his studies, he was growing into full size and strength. He sat down till his muscles dwindled, his digestion became disordered, his chest contracted, his lungs congested, and his head liable to periodical pains. He sat four years in college, and three years in theological application. Look at him now. The duties of his mind and heart were done, and faithfully so; but those of his body were left undone. Three hundred and seventy-five muscles, organs of motion, have been robbed of their appropriate action, for nine or ten years, and now they have become, alike with the rest of his frame, the prey of near one hundred and fifty diseased and irritable nerves." "Look at another case. Exposure, incident to the parson or missionary, has developed the disease in his chest, planted there while fitting himself for usefulness. He contracted a sedentary, while he was gaining a studious habit. That which he sows, that also shall he reap. The east winds gave him colds: a pulpit effort causes hoarseness and cough, oppression and pain; he becomes alarmed, and nervous; his views of usefulness begin to be limited. He must now go by direction, and not so much to labour, where otherwise he would have been most wanted, as to nurse his broken constitution, &c."

It has been well observed, that when thought shall need no brain, and nearly four hundred organs of motion shall cease to constitute the principal portion of the human body, then the student may dispense with muscular exertion; but, until then, he must observe those laws which the Creator has established for his guidance, and seek his happiness, not in denying their existence, but in yielding them willing and cheerful obedience.

Another frequent cause of ill health, among clergymen, is improper regimen. By this term, we mean only errors in diet and drinks, though it is often applied to other subjects. There is no class, perhaps, which suffers as much from disorders of the digestive organs, as the clergy; and none are more noted for a neglect, or violation of those rules on which the preservation of health depends. There has been so much quackery displayed by itinerant lecturers and ephemeral publications on this subject, that it is not strange that many should have been disgusted, and, for fear of incurring the charge of ultraism, have gone to the opposite extreme, and conformed, literally, to St. Paul's injunction, to "eat whatever was set before them, asking no questions," &c. Intemperate drinking has been hunted and scouted from good society, as a low, vulgar, and fatal practice; while intemperate eating, which is hardly less injurious to health, maintains its ground, and meets but little opposition. One grand error of clergymen, in relation to diet, is the too free use of animal food. Many have it upon their tables three times a day, and make it the principal article of their meals. We do not object to animal food, in moderation, nor on the supposition that it is not as easily digested as vegetables. We admit that it is more easily assimilated and converted to the purposes of nutrition; but we believe that, when used in excess, it furnishes to the literary, and those of sedentary habits, fluids of a too-stimulating character. It renders the blood thick, sizzly, and strongly predisposed to inflammatory diseases, in those of sedentary pursuits;* while the labouring class suffers comparatively but little from a similar diet.

* Persons of sedentary habits are oppressed, and ultimately become diseased, from the excess of nutriment which a full diet of animal food will occasion; such a condition, by some process not understood, is best corrected by acescent vegetables.—Dr. Paris.

We are fully aware of the unsettled state of professional opinion upon the subject of diet, (and this difference of opinion, we hold to be one of the principal causes of public scepticism, in relation to the efficacy of the medical art,) but, we believe that it is now fully proven, by actual experiment, that, if a person, who has previously been habituated to both animal and vegetable diet, be restricted exclusively to one or the other, he will fall off, and either become scorbutic, as in the case of sailors confined to animal food, or weak and emaciated, like most of those who, unfortunately, have made trial of the Graham system; and yet, facts abundantly show, that he is capable of subsisting upon either the one or the other, if trained to it from early childhood. The experiments made by Dr. Stoch, of Vienna, on this subject, are very conclusive. His object was to discover the relative effect of various simple substances, when used exclusively as articles of food, for a long space of time. In all such cases, he found that the system was reduced to a state of extreme debility, and that there was not a single aliment, capable, of itself, of sustaining the vigour of the body for any considerable period. By this kind of regimen Dr. Stoch ruined his own health, so as to induce premature death.*

No well-educated physician will deny that numerous diseases arise from an improper management of diet, and that a judicious regulation of it is all-important, in order to their cure; and, while we hold *quantity* to be of more importance than *quality* in diet, still we think there may be error in the opposite extreme, and he who eats

“ab ovo usque ad mala,”

has, in our estimation, ate something more than words; for we are gravely told, that, eat what we may, it is only “animal matter, vegetable matter, and condiment.” The maxim of Horace, “in medio tutissimus ibis,” is here true philosophy. Neither would we, with some, proscribe all

* A case in point. A student in college, a friend of the writer, for the sake of health and economy, attempted to live entirely on a diet of bread and milk. In a short time his eye-sight failed him, so that he had to relinquish his studies; his health gave way, and, in about a year afterwards, he died. He was a clergyman's son, and had always been accustomed to a full diet of animal food. There can be no doubt that many students have injured their health in the same way.

condiments ; for we hold, with Dr. Paris, that the gratification which attends a favourite meal, is in itself a specific stimulus to the organs of digestion, especially in weak and debilitated habits. Those, however, of the aromatic class, especially the foreign spices, must be used in great moderation ; for, though their use may be attended with temporary benefit, yet it is often at the expense of permanent mischief : while the appetite is stimulated, the tone of the stomach is destroyed.

Nevertheless, it is a popular error, and one from which, unfortunately, clergymen are by no means exempt, that debility, and a feeling of exhaustion and lassitude, call for stimulants, and a more generous diet ; when the fact is, that these are often merely symptoms of irritation, or inflammation of some organ, for the most part, of the stomach, and require for their relief a course of mild vegetable food, with entire abstinence from stimulants.—A spare and simple diet, properly persevered in, is a sovereign remedy for many of those cases which are supposed to require a directly contrary regimen. This remark will more particularly apply to those who have been accustomed to full living, and whose digestive powers have been weakened by food of a highly-stimulating character.

It has been argued by some, that, because God has given to the human system the power of withstanding, for years perhaps, inordinate indulgence, that therefore an attention to dietetic rules is of little consequence. But, let no one deceive himself by such a belief ; for every instance of intemperance in eating, as well as drinking, the constitution must, sooner or later, pay the full penalty. Present health furnishes no good reason for neglecting those precautionary means, which reason, philosophy, and experience prescribe, as adapted to the preservation of health ; and one of the most important of these, is *temperance in eating*.

We take it for granted, that there is no sensible man, at the present day, who will advocate the use of any intoxicating drink in health ; there is, therefore, no occasion to discuss this subject. But, notwithstanding the general disuse of alcoholic drinks by the clergy, there are yet not a few who still persist in their use, *as a medicine*, and, accordingly, take a little to aid digestion, especially after dinner. The celebrated Tissot remarks, that those

who make use of *liqueurs*, after their meals, in order to facilitate digestion, could not adopt a better plan, if they wished to produce a contrary effect, and totally destroy the powers of digestion. The same remark will hold true in relation to all alcoholic stimulants. If the stomach cannot digest lobster, roast beef, pastry, and a heterogeneous compound of some score of different articles, the inference is, that a *little brandy* is just the thing that is needed. Now, a more rational course would be, to adopt a more simple diet, and avoid those substances which cannot be digested without the aid of *medicine*. We need not observe, that the weight of medical authority, as well as experience, is altogether in favour of the latter course. The clergy, however, as a body, have done themselves great credit, by so generally adopting the principle, and the *practice* of total abstinence; for, in so doing, they have not only acted as Christians, but as patriots, and true physiologists.—As to tea and coffee, we believe them to be injurious, in most cases of debility and indigestion, and that they should be avoided, by those of a nervous and irritable temperament. They should never be taken for the purpose of inducing wakefulness at night; and where the effects are manifestly stimulating, their use should be entirely abandoned. No one can pretend that they are in any way necessary to health. Those who have substituted for them, milk and water, generally testify that the change has proved beneficial.

Another not uncommon cause of ministerial ill health, is *tampering with medicine*, where it is not indicated. It is to be regretted that men of intelligence on subjects in general, should often be so ignorant in relation to the science of life, and the means of preserving health. Quackery on all subjects, is the order of the day; and in the present degraded condition of the medical profession, it is hardly a matter of wonder, that the boastful promises of the mountebank, the seventh son, and the natural bonesetter, should make a more favourable impression on the public mind, than the quiet and unobtrusive pretensions of the man of real merit. But how sickening is it to see clergymen, and there are such, act as agents for the sale, or distribution of Hygiene Pills, and other nostrums,—articles, which we verily believe, have destroyed more lives, within the last ten years, than the sword, pestilence, and famine united. One half the

quack medicines in use, owe their reputation almost entirely to certificates of clergymen. There is no error more common than for ministers, as well as others, to imagine themselves *bilious*, especially if they are dyspeptic and hypochondriacal. Oh the bile, the wicked bile! how much has it to answer for! The first thing, in such a case, is to swallow down a quantity of bilious pills; or, perchance, a dose of calomel or blue pill may suffice; when in nine cases out of ten, the bile has no more to do with the symptoms than the tape worm. The truth is, the man has overloaded his stomach—has taxed his digestive powers too highly; and instead of practising abstinence, which is the true panacea, makes himself bilious by emetic medicine. We once attended a clergyman, (we had almost said, *gourmand*,) who was actually a slave to the pleasures of the table, who seemed to think more of what he should have for his dinner, than what he should himself serve out to his hearers on the Sabbath; who scented public dinners with the tact of a grey-hound, and was never known to be too late either at a public or private invitation: this man, who was admired for his talents and his eloquence, was unfortunately always *bilious*; and what is very remarkable, he never suspected that all his unpleasant symptoms were occasioned by over-eating, or that his uneasy feelings could be caused by any thing but *bile*. How often have we thought while listening to his eloquent *bilious* complaints, if your theory is correct, oh, what a curse to our race is the human liver! How much better had it been, had the liver, as well as *spleen*, according to Paley's hypothesis, been placed where it is, solely for the purpose of *packing*! Then gluttony would have had no scape-goat, and surfeiting no subterfuge.

It is to be feared, moreover, that clergymen do not make themselves sufficiently acquainted with the laws of physiology. It appears to us that this ought to be included in a course of theological education, and, indeed, of every system, designed to embrace the most important branches of human knowledge; and until this is the case, we must expect to witness a constant violation of the laws of life, and the numerous evils, consequent thereon. It is very evident, that what is called *experience*, on this subject, is a fallacious guide; for every man, let his habits of life be what they may, appeals to this as the *ultima ratio*, when

he is, perhaps, at the very time, a victim to disease, induced by a transgression of the laws of the organism. A large proportion of human suffering arises from this ignorance of our own structure, and the relation of the different parts of the system to each other, and to external objects. Every medical man knows and laments the extreme ignorance, so generally prevalent in regard to the simplest functions of the animal system; and hence, is often deprived of that cheerful and judicious co-operation on the part of the patient, and his friends, which is essential to a restoration to health. We were once consulted by a clergyman of sanguine temperament, and plethoric habit, who was very subject to nose-bleed, especially in the performance of his public duties. His services in the pulpit had, that very day, been interrupted by this cause; and he wanted advice, what course to pursue, both by way of prevention and cure. He had scarcely finished stating his case, when a report like a pistol, (from a corner of the room,) and the simultaneous discharge of the contents of a porter bottle, gave a significant hint as to the nature of the cause. We soon ascertained that he was in the habitual use of wine, porter, and other fermented drinks; and on Sunday, he took considerably more than his usual allowance, in order to *strengthen* him for its extra labours. This truly eloquent divine, had never suspected that full living, and the free use of fermented drinks had any thing to do with his nose-bleed, and we had great difficulty in persuading him to a more moderate course of living. Had the vessels of his brain been as yielding as those of his nostrils, apoplexy would probably, long before, have enrolled him among the victims of a "mysterious Providence." Here was a man, learned in his profession, ignorant of the commonest facts in physiology, and jeopardizing his life in subservience to a *false experience*, which told him that alcholic drinks were necessary, and imparted strength to the system. Again, a clergyman of our acquaintance, laboured under an aggravated form of dyspepsy, brought on by the use of tobacco, which he mistook for an affection of the heart, and supposed it to have been caused by mental suffering, and arduous labours; thus mistaking both the disease and the cause. A slight acquaintance with the sympathy existing between the heart and stomach, would have furnished him a clue to his ailment, and directed him to a proper course of treat-

ment. Yet this man's *experience* was altogether in favour of tobacco!

But we need not multiply cases: our object is attained if we can but impress upon the clergy the absolute necessity of acquainting themselves with the laws and principles of physiology, in order to the preservation of their health. Let them diligently trace the connexion between broken health, and habits of life, and remember, that though an infringement of its laws is often slow in manifesting its effects, and becomes serious chiefly by frequency of repetition, yet that it must sooner or later terminate in ruinous consequences.

Before concluding our remarks, it may be well to notice some of the diseases to which clergymen are most subject. These are chronic laryngitis (sometimes called bronchitis,) dyspepsy, pulmonary consumption, headache, debility, palpitation of the heart; and the whole tribe of nervous affections, are, for the most part, merely symptomatic of the last affection. We might, perhaps, with propriety add to these cerebral apoplexy; and we can now call to mind three distinguished divines, within the sphere of our acquaintance, who have, within the last few months, suddenly fallen victims to this disease.

In these instances, it was evidently the result of intense and long-continued mental excitement, and intellectual effort. Chronic laryngitis has attained such an alarming degree of prevalence among the clergy, that it may almost be viewed in the light of an epidemic. It is but a few years since this disease was unknown, almost by name, or if now and then a case did occur, they were generally of so mild a character as to yield to very simple treatment. That it is not in the commencement, at least, a bronchial affection, is evident from the fact, that it is unattended with cough, difficulty of breathing, or any of those symptoms which usually attend inflammation of the mucous membrane of the trachea and its ramifications. It seems to be confined, primarily to the organs of voice, or the muscles of the larynx, particularly those of the cricoid, thyroid, and arytenoid cartilages. Most frequently, it attacks in a slow and insidious manner; the first symptom being merely a slight hoarseness, scarcely sufficient to attract notice, which gradually increases, and unless arrested by proper treatment, terminates in ulceration. The *uvula*

is, for the most part, much elongated, and may cause a short, harassing cough, by its irritation. The ulceration sometimes extends to the tonsils and palate, and it is not unusual to find the membrane covering the *chordae vocales*, so much thickened as to encroach upon the glottis. The disease differs from any described in medical works, not only in being of a more chronic character, but in terminating in ulceration and disorganization. The cases of *chronic laryngitis*, described by Mr. Lawrence and Dr. Cheyne, terminated generally in suffocation, caused by an effusion of serum, in the cellular tissue beneath the mucous membrane. In the disease, as it is now modified by causes to us unknown, the inflammation seems confined exclusively to the mucous lining of the larynx, and parts adjacent, and its peculiar characteristic is, to terminate in ulceration. Where it terminates fatally, it destroys life by producing hectic fever, emaciation, and general prostration; or by involving the pulmonary apparatus, inducing the same symptoms, with those of phthisis superadded.

As to the causes of this disease, we do not pretend to be much wiser than our readers. In most cases which have come under our observation, we have thought that we have found an adequate cause, *in exercising the vocal organs disproportionately to the rest of the body*. The system not being strengthened and hardened by suitable exercise, the vocal apparatus, the most delicate and irritable structure in the body, gives way under the excessive task laid upon it. Seamstresses often lose the use of the right hand and arm from the too constant use of the needle; but stonecutters, who also use the right arm, in a still more laborious employment, rarely if ever meet with the same accident; and the reason doubtless is to be found, in the different degrees of strength and resistance, imparted to the system, by the different species of exercise. We believe then, that the grand cause of laryngitis in clergymen, *is speaking in too loud a tone, too long at one time, and with too great frequency*. We have heard many a clergyman, speaking even in a moderately-sized house, as if they imagined themselves to be St. Paul standing on Mars' Hill, or as if their whole audience were consigned to deafness.—Some of the methodist clergy, display powers of voice at their camp meetings, which a Commodore might envy in a storm. If the articulation be distinct, it requires far less volume of

sound to fill a large church, than is generally supposed ; and the loudest speakers are often not understood from inattention to this fact. It is true that the public requires a more animated and impassioned style of speaking than formerly, and no man can aspire to popularity whose eloquence is not of a bold and fervid kind ; but the penalty is often a speedy prostration of the physical powers, and perhaps an untimely death. The fate of a Summerfield, a Larned, a Henry, a Cornelius, a Griffin, and a host of others, will testify to the truth of this remark. But this style of eloquence is not necessarily destructive to health, and would not prove so, if the discourse were confined within moderate limits and proper attention paid to exercise, diet, &c. But an harrangue of an hour or more, and perhaps three times repeated in the course of one day, is sufficient to break down the vocal organs, if not the constitution of most clergymen, especially when aided by half a dozen evening lectures weekly.

Churches are often constructed with little or no attention to the laws of acoustics. The convenience and health of the preacher is as little consulted, as if he were an automaton trumpeter, or Maelzel's chess player. It is expected that he can "hold forth" in one of these huge structures, with as much ease, as he can converse in his own parlour. He is literally to "cry aloud and spare not" and lift up his voice like a trumpet." This, then, is another cause of the disease under consideration. Again, speaking in damp basements, where there are few or no facilities for ventilation, is another exciting cause of laryngitis. Some suppose that speaking with the head thrown back, thus producing an unnatural tension and contraction of the muscles of the larynx, has an unfavourable effect upon the organs of speech. This is doubtless an unnatural position, and more injurious in its consequences, than one more easy and less constrained. Preaching when under the influence of a cold, and especially if hoarseness be present, ought by all means to be avoided. This form of laryngitis, it has been contended, is merely symptomatic of dyspepsy and not of idiopathic affection. This opinion, however, is entirely erroneous and unsupported by proof. It is, however, like every other disease, aggravated by a disordered condition of the digestive organs, and alleviated by remedying the same. Some have attempted to trace this disease to

the use of anthracite coal, as its prevalence, they say, was contemporaneous with the general introduction of this species of fuel. It is a sufficient reply to this, to state that it attacks indiscriminately those who do, and those who do not use this article of fuel. We know at least six country clergymen, who have laboured under this affection, and who have never used anthracite coal at all. Moreover the disease prevails as extensively in the South, where this coal has never been introduced, as in Philadelphia, New York, or any of the northern States.

The custom of performing funeral services at the grave, with the head uncovered, as practiced extensively in our large cities, is extremely detrimental to health, and often the apparent exciting cause of laryngitis. Burying grounds are generally damp and unwholesome, and the time of day also, at which funerals are mostly attended, is calculated to give this cause a fatal efficiency.

We have already alluded to exposure to evening air, after the excitement of public exercises, and while probably in a state of perspiration, as another frequent cause of clerical disease. We can recollect more than one instance where an attack of acute laryngitis was induced by such exposure, and where the penalty was protracted suffering terminating in death.

With respect to the treatment of chronic laryngitis, it is not our design to discuss the subject at length, neither is it possible to point out a course which will apply to every individual case. This is a disease, to which the old adage holds pre-eminently true, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." We are inclined to believe, in the first place, that absolute rest of the organs is indispensable to a cure; and in the next place, few cases can be so effectually cured, but that the disease will return, by exposure to causes similar to those which produced it. Owing to the extremely delicate structure of the organs concerned, there is as great danger of this result, as there is of putting a delicate musical instrument out of tune, by roughly handling it.—Pure air, travelling, and a mild, but nourishing diet, have proved eminently beneficial in most cases that have come under our notice; and we have also found leeching, followed by an issue at the lower part of the neck, afford great relief. An attention to the digestive organs is highly important. Gargles of a demulcent kind may be used to advan-

tage, and also at an advanced stage of the disease, those of a stimulating nature, such as a weak solution of the sulphates of zinc or copper, or what is still better, the nitrate of silver, of the strength of six or eight grains to an ounce of water. Some cases have been cured by a residence in a warm climate, and others, by making the tour of Europe. This last is a fashionable prescription, and for the most part a useful one; but the tour of the United States would probably prove as beneficial and less expensive. The body should be well guarded by flannels worn next to the skin, and warm bathing and the flesh brush are useful auxiliaries. Walking, and riding on horseback, are the best species of exercise, and they should be persevered in till the disease is found to yield. This course will generally prove successful, if commenced before the disease has made much progress. With respect to other diseases to which clergymen are particularly liable, they are to be prevented, by avoiding those causes, which we have already pointed out. Attention to a few simple rules, will generally ensure health, usefulness, personal enjoyment, and long life.

Believing that, under Providence, an efficient and faithful clergy is to be the grand instrument in the conversion of the world, and that it actually is at the present day the chief support and safe guard of all the social, civil and religious interests of man, these remarks are submitted, in the humble hope that they may be productive of good, and tend to the promotion of virtue, happiness and religion.

ART. IX. THE LAST EVIDENCE OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

By REV. THOMAS CURTIS, Pastor of the Baptist Church, Bangor, Maine.

"*That they all may be one; as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe, that thou hast sent me.*"—John, xvii. 21.

To the Editor of the Lit. and Theol. Review.

BANGOR, AUG. 1836.

DEAR SIR—These are, in fact, words of prophecy; and, often as they have been quoted, may they not, to use a phrase of Lord Bacon's, contain "a *germinant*," meaning, reserved for the time of which they speak, to develop? It is certain, that the church and the world, have never yet sustained, towards each other, the relative positions here described. When she was one, "the whole world lay in wickedness." She was but moving forward to its partial conversion. When the Christian cause became extended in the world, to the widest circumference it ever reached, her apparent unity was no more.

The words, surely, have *this* meaning latent in them, which the commentators, so far as I have searched, have very generally overlooked. Our Saviour prays, *first*, distinctly, for his disciples then around, and contemporary with Him; *next*, for all those who should believe through their word; and, *finally*, for the perfect union of both. The union contemplated is not that of any two, or a few successive generations of Christ's followers. Much less are we to confine it to the most perfect of Christians throughout any one given age of the church. Desirable as this may be; indispensable as it would appear to be, in the "latter days," to the final triumph of Christianity; elevating and gratifying as is the anticipation of such days, to all but the most drivelling sectarians; this, exclusively, is not the thing which Christ desired. It is far more than this. It is *the union, in one SPIRIT, CHARACTER, and outward DEVELOPMENT of Christianity, of ALL the successive generations of the Church.*

To the difficulties of realizing the limited idea, *union in the present, or a succeeding generation of Christ's*

followers, the attention of your readers has been seasonably, and ably called. Holding up, in the first instance, (Art. VIII. Sept. 1835.) the Good derived, you have, subsequently, pointed out both the evils which urge us to seek it, and the difficulties to be apprehended in our road (Art. X. Mar. 1836). Union, however, is conceivable in *one* generation: it has often been attempted, at the sacrifice of characteristic principles; principles meant divinely to combine and animate, and which shall yet be found to pervade the whole continuous body of the church. It may, then, be an union of profession in the bond of sacraments, diverting men *from* the union of the spirit in the bonds of Gospel peace. It may unduly depress the ordinances and forms of our spiritual religion; bring *them* down to the level of a worldly age, instead of aiming, as we should in every age, to direct upwards, and bring up, the views of worldly Christians, to the level of primitive Christianity. To something of this deteriorating process, allow me, in Christian freedom, to remark, the first article in your last number (June, 1836,) has appeared, to many of your subscribers, to *tend*.

Allow me, I. to attempt to deduce, from this language of our Saviour, uttered in the moment of his highest inspiration, a PRINCIPLE of redemption from all the evils and errors of the sectarian spirit. II. To suggest some practical efforts, which the state of parties in Christendom seems, even now, to demand at our hands.

I. Our Saviour's words grasp the whole truth of our Brotherhood. Christians are only so to attempt, or desire to be, one with each other, as, in all circumstances, to be and remain as one, with Christ and his apostles. His prayer is not, that the Christians of a remote, or of *the* remotest and most numerous generation, nor that those of the immediate generation to which he addressed himself, (and, perhaps, the *first* and *last* will be, each in their respective agencies, the most important and effective generation,) may be one;—but, *that they ALL may be one.*" The busiest and latest age will never do its duty, or accomplish its high destiny, without a steady regard to "the *foundation* of the Apostles and Prophets;"—to the truths, tempers, and lives of the very first age. The first age had never survived its hurricanes and earthquakes of difficulty, if its Catholic faith and hope had not been so strongly

fixed, as we know they were, on the last ages, on the very "coming of the Lord." Every limitation of the scope of this memorable prayer, is calculated to satisfy us with inferior objects, and to suggest inferior means of Christian union. If disposed to urge this union, let us "crane up" our minds to the full "height of this great argument."

It will remind *us*, at least, of the divinity of that blessed Truth, which, alone, has energy sufficient to create, and keep alive, in a world like this, the needful love.

Have not plans of union generally failed, Mr. Editor, just because they have been either local, or temporary, or formed on the *contracted* standard of some one given period of the Church? That is, they have failed, as, on a full review of the subject, might be expected, at the point where sectarianism has always begun, and renewed its strength, among Christians; *i. e.* where they have had too partial an eye on the spiritual interests, or have gloried too much in the example, (perhaps in the real *worthies*,) of some one age;—when they have not taken *enough* of the glorious field of Christian church interests into view;—when they have been, either not historical enough, or, with inspiration still breathing on them from Scripture, not prophetic enough, in their views;—when they have forgotten, that insight into this subject especially, is both retrospection and anticipation. Men vainly seek to destroy sects, by the prejudices that created them,—to reform them, in the very spirit by which they became most corrupt.

They have embraced certain distinctive forms of the Christian faith, or discipline. They, of course, are well acquainted with the leading writers and exemplars of that faith and form; writers produced, generally, by the necessities of *their* age,—master spirits, some of them, in all the great and practical truths of the gospel; feeble narrow-minded men, others, as ever led a party, or wielded a pen. Good men, these last may have been, but men who have magnified particular truths, points of Christian doctrine, or duties of a holy life, out of all proportion with other doctrines and duties; men who have fostered, unwittingly, (though not, always, unwarned,) whole families of monstrous errors, in the hot-bed of their zeal for truth. With minds formed on such models, acquainted only with such standards, or not even sturdily determined

to be independent of their influence, shall *we* attempt to reform the face of Christendom? Thus *originated* the vast majority of sects.

Let us glance at the subject-matter of the chief differences, among those who "hold the Head;" and of what is involved in *this* phrase we shall say more, hereafter. They embrace difficulties in church government, church discipline, and in our general church-relations to an ungodly world.

Now, charity and wisdom alike require, that the aspect of *all* the governments of men be, in measure, adapted to the age in which they live, and the spheres they occupy. Certain cardinal points are immutable. There is a supreme allegiance to Christ, a supreme deference to Scripture; and a host of plain things and common objects, in which all are agreed, that remain unchanged, unchangeable. But, *necessity* obtrudes particular points on a particular age of the church; and the records of *that* age contain these points, of course, chiefly.

Discipline within the church, will, on similar principles, be required also to be varied; and the highest interests of an ever-changing world demand that we speak its various languages, and even dialects of thought and feeling, that we become, if "*all* things" in one age, different things in different ages, "*to all* men," that we may, by all means, save some. What is peculiar, is by wise and holy men at *all* times duly and wholesomely combined with what is common, and once for all delivered to the church of every age. The combination, however, does not always appear in the page of history. What is novel, does. And now, between the forgetfulness of this, and the mischievous conception that *precisely* the government, the discipline, and the language of one famous age, are in all points to be followed by another age, all the extreme differences of sectarian opinion have been *first* begotten. How extremes have gone on to beget each other, is yet more plain. Really good men, have at one time felt themselves, and all the church within their purview, iron-bound in forms; unwisely, therefore—often half-madly,—have they, at another time, warred against *all* forms. Now, and for a generation or two, a whole region of Christian churches has been disciplined into the stiffness of death; anon, and for another generation, all discipline becomes discarded.

Illustrations pervade every era and corner of the church. The government founded by the apostles (we say not what it was in form,) is modified—and Diocesan Episcopacy is established. This stiffens into Popery, and is defended by the sword, civil and persecuting. Popery is resisted by the Anabaptists in Germany and by Knox in Scotland, with a violence fully equal to that by which it was established. The Puritans in Old England reject Episcopacy; in New England, they erect as tyrannical a government of the many, as that of the few hated prelates, they had crossed the Atlantic to abjure. From the church of England, on questions of mere form, (designed originally to defend her from the Dissenters,) a Wesley and a Whitefield, preaching their own doctrines, are ejected; Whitefield boldly preaches those doctrines on both sides of the Atlantic, and leaves *no* church. Mr. Wesley, wide awake to this evil, constitutes himself sole leader of the discipline, and legal possessor of all the ecclesiastical property, of his numerous followers. "What a piece of work is man!" What a yet more incongruous medley of jarring motives. Christian men, acting upon selfish and worldly—local or temporary expedients, in Christ's church!

Where is the redeeming PRINCIPLE? Let the question be well pondered by your readers and correspondents. It is found only, we contend, in the love of the truth as true for eternity, and of the Church and her Institutions as *the Church of all ages*. We shall utterly fail in grappling with the Sectarian spirit (if I have grasped the meaning of our Lord's prayer) should we attempt to reform the church regarding her only as adapted to any one age. For this *is* the Sectarian spirit. This has wrought all the mischief. Nothing must be *law* but the Bible; but the last evidence, that the desire of all nations has come, shall be wholly of Himself; shall combine the experience of *all* His church; shall gather the treasures of truth and wisdom from her *whole* history. It shall combine within the church a love of neighbour as one's self, to fulfill the law;—a love of the brotherhood more than one's self, to fulfil Christ's new command, and the obligations of his high example under the gospel. From all selfishness, it shall exhibit a practical redemption in Christians, like that of the primitive brethren; a deliverance from all pride, from the spirit of *dictation*, and from the love of power, like that of the holy apostles;

a triumph over the fear of man, and even a coward's love of life, like that of the noble army of Martyrs. It shall sacrifice all exclusive, personal and party interests to the social and eternal interest of man. Homogeneous every where with the claims of daily duty, the *elements* of its patriotism shall be philanthropy; of its philanthropy, piety; of its piety, *likeness to Christ*. It will shake all nations, when God shall fill his House with *this* glory. No truth will ever stand upon the basis of making so many other things false, if this be untrue.

II. To look practically toward this great consummation,—I would submit, that there are certain efforts which the state of parties, both in England and America, permit, and even demand us even now to make.

1. An effort to think patiently, kindly and respectfully of the argument opposed to ours, on points of difference between Christians. Without any effort, we slide into the habit of thinking of them contemptuously. The good man's adoption of an error cannot make it either at all true or altogether harmless; but demonstrates that it is not necessarily a fatal one, and that is a *clear case*, if his character is clear with us. There might have been a worm hole in Aaron's rod; but this did not prevent it from budding.

2. An effort *not* to think *too much* of our difference, or of the amount and value of the truths at issue. Differences among Christians may wisely perhaps be treated like personal afflictions. God sends them. They are not to be despised; they require investigation, conversing with.—They carry sometimes "a precious jewel" in an ugly "head." They are not to be magnified. We must not "faint" under them. Charity is wounded by our indulging either of the propensities above mentioned.

3. Still more important is it, I submit, that we make resolute efforts to discriminate between the *negative* and *positive* opposition to truth, which we think the arguments or the practices of our differing brother to contain. The spirit and character of a man, and by consequence, those of a number of men, may soon show us, that he or they hold a certain error, rather by *defect* of feeling the appropriate evidence, than any pertinacious opposition, or criminal indifference to the truth. There may even have been an unusual lack of *opportunity* to know the truth in the case. A French officer, a convert in England to christianity from

Deism, first made me feel deeply the value of this distinction. He was converted among some christians who did not embrace those distinguishing doctrines of a moderate Calvinism for which I should contend, and which he soon afterwards received. I then asked him what his former friends thought of the change in his opinions? "Sir," replied he promptly, "I have not changed my opinions, *I have progressed in my knowledge.*" Calvinists undoubtedly may and should regard Evangelical Arminians, as erroneous by defect—the Episcopalian should form this charitable opinion of other labourers in Christ's vineyard. The Baptist should entertain this view of his Pedobaptist brother, and he is under the same obligation to reciprocate it. How often will it be found, that defective as our Christian brethren may be in one point of doctrine or duty, they have directed their attention to various other points which we have overlooked, and that theirs' is "the mote" of deficiency, ours, the "beam!"

4. Let us also thank God and take courage, at the reflection, that the chief points of difference between evangelical Christians, involve either truths *secondary* only in importance, or second in the *order* of the time at which we expect them to be received. They regard the ordinances more than the doctrines; the profession much more than the possession of Christianity; the government more than the integral being of the church. We should make strenuous efforts to point out and sustain *this* distinction every where.

5. To speak more specifically, Mr. Editor, I hope the day is not far distant, when there might be proposed a hearty and broad union in certain public services of religion, with a view to the entire evangelization of this country. We have seen, that in our Lord's memorable prayer, preserved by St. John, the redeeming and guiding PRINCIPLE of re-union among his people, is afforded to us; and that He presents this principle as efficient in the conversion of a world. We should not seek to be united for the mere purpose, either of admiring, or enjoying our union, but to make it bear on some corresponding effort for the glory of God. May not this suggest that we should pray earnestly, often, and *more unitedly*, in the spirit of this comprehensive petition? Is not a communion in prayer possible and practicable where, unhappily, communion in no other ordi-

nance of religion could be attempted? To me it seems, that it is quite practicable, Sir, and ought to be *acted upon* among *all* who maintain our Saviour's proper Deity and mediation, salvation by grace alone, through faith in the blood of Christ, and the necessity of a personal regeneration, or change of heart, by the Spirit of God. And this is what I have meant in this paper, by "holding the Head."

I should rejoice, Sir, to see the true friends of Christian union meet, and produce some plan of a short liturgical and extempore service, to be forthwith used among us on a Saturday evening, or early on the Lord's day morning—having the harmony of the whole Christian church, and the greater success of a preached gospel, for its particular subjects. Where, in point of numbers they could be accommodated, I would have all the evangelical denominations meet, "with one accord, in one place," to use such a service, and their clergy, conjointly, or alternately, conduct it. On a week-day evening, especially at the monthly concert, how often would it be a decided and heart-warming improvement, to gather together all who attend the scattered services of a town, into one church?

This I should hope,—“watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints,” in private, together with consistent lives—might result in some new manifestation of the spirit of charity among us, so that we should soon be anxious for a plan of *united public preaching* of the gospel throughout the country—preaching, designed rather for the many thousands of Sabbath-breakers, than the few hundreds of Sabbath-keepers, and for the bringing home to Christ's fold, the millions who are, I fear, even in this enlightened country and age, “*as sheep having no shepherd!*” Have your readers hearts to weep over such? Then they will bestir themselves. Our aim must be, at no proselytism from party to party, but at conversion from ungodliness to Christ.

LITERARY NOTICE.

Physical Theory of Another Life. By the author of Natural History of Enthusiasm. New York, D. Appleton and Co. 200 Broadway, 1836.

Whoever has supposed that the increase of knowledge bears any great proportion to the increase of books, or that literature is gaining much by the constant accession of new authors, is doubtless doomed to disappointment. We have so long been surfeited with what is new, and found so little that is original, that we have begun to entertain the suspicion, that literature is only passing through a general metempsychosis; that the souls of antiquated volumes are emigrating from their decayed bodies, and making their appearance again in others more genteel and spacious. We think we have actually met with the contents of several popular works in their pre-existent state, and must be permitted to say, we were as much delighted with them when they formed a few paragraphs in some ancient divine, as when spread out to their present size and dimensions.

This is one of the few volumes now issuing from the press, which does not contain what is much better thought and said in a thousand other books. The author has the honesty to conclude, that his reader should have some equivalent for his time and money; that the Christian public, with the present demands upon their charities, ought not to be taxed for common-place thoughts, vapid declamation and crude and dangerous speculations.

The writer has several times appeared before the Christian public, and has acquired a reputation which the present volume fully sustains. He doubtless possesses a most vigorous and comprehensive mind. His taste and genius seem to have inclined him to metaphysical subjects, and he has most successfully cultivated such as have any important bearing on Christianity. As a specimen of his style, we quote a passage, in which we think, he has presented the arguments for the existence of mind and matter, in a very forcible and happy manner.

"The materialist—and in this argument the materialist must take the atheist as his companion, the materialist says—"It is impossible for me to doubt the existence of matter; for it is under my touch, it is before my eyes, and its properties are the subject of the only sciences that are absolute in their method of reasoning, and infallible in their results. But as to mind, otherwise than as it is merely a function of animal organization, or a product of cerebral secretions, I know nothing, and can know nothing of it, and the inquiry concerning it ever has been, and must always remain obscure and unsatisfactory.

"But the spiritualist condemns this summary treatment of the argument by his antagonist, as crude and illogical, and such as can satisfy none who are competent to analyse strictly their own consciousness. He affirms that this statement of the case by his opponent takes for granted the very facts that are to be proved; and in reply to the materialist, he says—"All that I contend for, and which I affirm to be intuitively certain, and known without proof, you first tacitly assume, and then formally deny. What are all these sensations of touch and sight, and what are these demonstrations of mathematical science of which you speak, but so many *states of the mind*—so many mental phenomena, as I may term them, which, while they imply necessarily the existence of mind, do but

render the existence of matter probable; or at best demonstrate its reality by a circuit of reasoning? I will grant you that an external world may exist, and I believe that it does exist: but this very belief, let it rise as high as it may, together with the argument that sustains it, are still only so many elements of my mental consciousness, and can never nullify or annihilate that of which they are parts." This skepticism concerning the reality of matter, and an external world, which is of a far more subtle and sweeping kind than that of the materialist concerning mind, he finds it impossible to supplant; and he feels himself undermined in his assault upon spiritualism, and his foot sinks whichever way he endeavours to advance. His opponent therefore leaves him with this defiance—"Prove the existence of an external world if you please, or if you can;—and I do believe it to exist; but I believe it by inference; and therefore hold it as a truth, if not inferior in certainty, yet assuredly as subordinate to that primary truth—the existence of mind."

The object of the writer in the present work, is to point out the evident connexions which philosophy has traced between the mind and body; to describe reciprocal operations and influences of these upon each other—to show to what extent, the mind is circumscribed in its perceptions; impeded, thwarted, and interrupted in its operations; and impaired in its powers by the body. Then to show, that as a more delicate and exquisite organization of body, would add so much to the powers of the mind, would so extend its perceptions, and increase its knowledge, that both reason and revelation make it probable that such an organization will be bestowed; that hereafter the soul will be united to a body, not only free from the inherited defects of the present, but also *differing materially in its nature.*

We think that he has treated a subject, on which revelation is almost silent, with becoming caution: that he attributes no undue authority to his conclusions. He ever, throughout his investigations, manifests a pious respect for the authority of Scripture, the modesty of a truly great mind, and the caution and suspicion of his conclusions which characterize the real philosopher who respects the bounds which God has prescribed to human enquiries.

That the imperfection and corruptibility of the human body which have been inherited from our first parents will hereafter be removed; that the body will be restored to its original perfection, is an undisputed truth of revelation. But it is the great object of our author, in his ingenious and beautiful discussions, to go much beyond this; to make it probable, not only that the body will be perfect and incorruptible, but also materially different in nature from what it was. That the person will possess a perfection of senses—a power of locomotion—a command over matter—a freedom from mental fatigue—a power of reasoning, memory and association, now almost inconceivable.

Here we think our author has failed in his proof. His reasoning is ingenious and plausible, but not convincing. We think he should have proved, that, if the body is to receive such an important change, the perceptive mind should also receive one equal and similar. He seems to take it for granted that every thing requisite belongs to it as mind already; that its powers at present are only repressed by the grossness of the instruments through which they act. Yet he has admitted that the senses are only the instruments through which the mind acts; and that the mind is inherently percipient of light, heat, sound, &c.; that these inherent powers have been bestowed by God: they of course, have their limits, and were accommodated to the organs which they were to use; they doubtless differ in different orders of beings, and in different beings of the same order. Now, are we to suppose, that God did not originally

accommodate these powers of the mind to the nature of the body with which he had invested it? Could he have immersed or rather smothered intellects the most noble and exalted in the bodies of our first parents, in bodies so gross and coarsely organized as not to be able to develope a thousandth part of the inherent powers of mind? Could he have left it till the fall and recovery of man should make it, in some way, expedient to bestow on the human race, bodies in some respect adapted to the high character of their minds?

That our bodies will be raised spiritual and incorruptible, is the belief of all who respect the authority of revelation. Though the real Christian expects and intensely desires to possess a body fit to be the servant of a holy soul, he desires with still greater intensity to be free from the struggles of the flesh; from the remains of indwelling sin. He desires not principally to become an expert reasoner, a skilful mathematician or natural philosopher, in another life. He will of course adore the perfections of God in the Creation—but the great work of redemption will be that which will fix all his mental and moral powers.

We are compelled to think the speculations of our author, amusing and ingenious rather than useful—from the nature of the subjects, they can be thoroughly understood by very few. We have the highest respect for the philanthropy, piety and talents of our author. We think his book contains much that is new and curious; but we think Baxter has come much nearer to *the true theory of another life*, in his Saint's everlasting Rest. He has kept reason silent, and listened to Scripture; and we know of no book except the bible so well adapted to make the great subject of another life a subject of innocent, useful and delightful speculation.

A

An

the
he
tha
As
we
LI
BE
im
By
the
not
we
tha
and
hig
ing
a r

hig
and
gat
rit
a s
the